DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 046 PS 008 796

TITLE	Child and Family Services Act, 1975. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United State Senate, Ninety-Fourth Congress, First Session. Part 6.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
PUB DATE	Apr 75
NOTE	258p.; Not available in hard copy due to print size of original; For related documents, see PS 008 790-799
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Care; Child Care Centers; Child Welfare; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Legislation; Family Day Care; *Family Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Health Services; Infants; Medical Services; Migrant Welfare Services; Minority Groups; Nutrition; Parents; Preschool Children; Social Services; Standards; State Federal Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*Child and Family Services Act; Legislative Hearings

ABSTRACT

This document records proceedings of the joint hearings on the Child and Family Services Act, 1975 (bills S.626 and H.R.2966). Included are witnesses' testimony of April 25 and 26, 1975, statements presented, and additional information (including related publications and communications). Appendices contain questions submitted to witnesses appearing on April 25 and 26, 1975, and their accompanying answers. (SB)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1975

ED127046

PS008796

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 626 and H.R. 2966

TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES TO CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

PART 6

APRIL 25 AND 26, 1975
MONTPELIER, VT.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
57-640 O WASHINGTON : 1976

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
ALAN CRANSTON, California
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

DONALD ELISBURG, *General Counsel*
MARJORIE M. WHITTAKER, *Chief Clerk*
JAY B. CUTLER, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ALAN CRANSTON, California

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

A. SIDNEY JOHNSON III, *Professional Staff Member*
LARRY GREENBERG, *Minority Counsel*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1975

Page

Davis, Thomas C., secretary, Agency of Human Services, State of Vermont 923

Russell, Karen V., Ph. D., director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Vermont State Department of Education 925

Gerhart, Rolland C., Jr., director, Office of Child Development, Agency of Human Services, State of Vermont 927

Ploof, Allen R., director, division of social services, Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services 928

Heymering, Marinus, Jr., president, Vermont Child Care '76 Campaign, Inc 930

D'Olier, Ann, teacher/director, The Tots School, Montpelier, Vt 933

LeFevre, R. James, chairman, Child Advocates, Inc., Burlington, Vt 934

Albert, Daniel, director, University of Vermont Day Care Center, Burlington, Vt 936

McIntyre, Natalie, Manchester, Vt 938

Much, Charlotte A., director, Sugar Maple Children's Center, Inc., Rutland, Vt 939

Franzway, John, administrator, Day Care Center, Norwich, Vt 941

Martin, Peg, member, Day Care Advisory Committee 942

Babcock, Annette, director, Champlain Valley Family Development Corp 947

Rupert, David J., director, Bennington-Rutland Head Start 948

Bloch, John, director, Orleans County Council of Social Agencies, Inc., Worcester, Vt 951

McKee, Marion C., M.D., director, mental retardation and neurology programs, Vermont State Department of Health 959

Holmes, Frederick C., M.D., American Academy of Pediatrics, St. Albans, Vt 961

Grams, Armin, professor of human development, School of Home Economics, University of Vermont 964

Jameson, Gladys B., assistant professor, early childhood and human development program, School of Home Economics, University of Vermont 968

Waite, Marion E., Department of Mental Health, New England Task Force on Mental Health Services for Children 973

Teare, Meredith Leavitt, early childhood consultant, Rutland Mental Health Service, Rutland, Vt 975

Hartman, Ed., mental health school/home coordinator, Holland, Vt 982

Strauss, Roger, executive director, Washington County Mental Health Services 985

Jewett, Patricia A., Swampscott, Mass., chairperson, Public Policy Committee of the New England Association for the Education of Young Children 986

Sazer, Nina, State coordinator, New Hampshire Children 1976, Concord, N.H. 990

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1975

Giancola, Joseph, president, board of directors, Sugar Maple Children's Center, Rutland, Vt 1035

Stearns, Marguerite B., board member, Consumer Controlled Community Child Care, Inc., Springfield, Vt 1036

Ducolon, Colin, board member, Champlain Valley Family Development Corp., Burlington, Vt 1037

Page

Angney, Alice, parent of a handicapped child, Montpelier, Vt 1042
Stambler, Kay, parent of a handicapped child, Burlington, Vt 1043
Walker, Patricia, day care parent, St. Albans, Vt 1046
Towle, Gail, parent personnel committee, representing the Northeast Kingdom Head Start Policy Council 1048
Brink, Helen, parent of a day care child, Burlington, Vt 1050
Hathaway, Suzanne D., parent of a day care child, Rutland, Vt 1052
Bussino, Irene, parent of a day care child, Rockingham, Vt 1053
Miller, Clarence, Mrs., parent, Morrisville, Vt 1057
LeBlanc, Roger, farmer, East Hardwick, Vt 1060
LaBarge, Dolores, Morrisville, Vt 1060
Murray, Margaret, parent of a day care child, Waterbury, Vt 1064
Green, Alicia M., parent of a child in day care, Rutland, Vt 1066
Seymour, Michele, parent of a child in day care, Burlington, Vt 1071
Kennedy, Judy, parent, West Charleston Parent-Child Center, Vermont 1072
Allaire, Jeanne, parent of a child in day care, Chester, Vt., member of Chester-Andover Title I Policy Advisory Committee 1073
Powell, Ethel, Barton Parent-Child Center, Barton, Vt 1074
Harmon, Esther, grandmother of a Head Start/day care child, member 5-C board of directors and Head Start Policy Council, North Springfield, Vt 1076
Weart, Joan, parent of day care children, Sugar Maple Day Care Center, Rutland, Vt 1077
Abbott, John, paramedic, People Free Clinic, Inc., Burlington, Vt 1079
Raynolds, Ann, director, Consumer-Controlled Community Child Care Inc., Windsor and Windham Counties, State of Vermont 1080
Kunin, Hon. Madeleine, member, State of Vermont House of Representatives 1108
Daniels, Hon. Robert V., member, State of Vermont Senate 1110

STATEMENTS

Abbott, John, paramedic, People Free Clinic, Inc., Burlington, Vt 1079
Albert, Daniel, director, University of Vermont Day Care Center, Burlington, Vt 936
Allaire, Jeanne, parent of a child in day care, Chester, Vt., member of Chester-Andover Title I Policy Advisory Committee 1073
Angney, Alice, parent of a handicapped child, Montpelier, Vt 1042
Babcock, Annette, director, Champlain Valley Family Development Corp 947
Betsinger, Signe, director of the school of home economics, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., prepared statement 1027
Bloch, John, director, Orleans County Council of Social Agencies, Inc., Worcester, Vt 951
  Prepared statement 995
Brink, Helen, parent of a day care child, Burlington, Vt 1050
Bussino, Irene, parent of a day care child, Rockingham, Vt 1053
Champlain Valley Family Development Corp., prepared statement 1039
Consumer-Controlled Community Child Care, Inc., Windsor and Windham Counties, Vt., prepared statement 1086
Daniels, Hon. Robert V., member, State of Vermont Senate 1110
Davis, Thomas C., secretary, Agency of Human Services, State of Vermont 923
D'Olier, Ann, teacher/director, The Tots School, Montpelier, Vt 933
Ducolon, Colin, board member, Champlain Valley Family Development Corp., Burlington, Vt 1037
  Prepared statement 1039
Franzway, John, administrator, Day Care Center, Norwich, Vt 941
Gerhart, Rolland C., Jr., director, Office of Child Development, Agency of Human Services, State of Vermont 927
Giancola, Joseph, president, board of directors, Sugar Maple Children's Center, Rutland, Vt 1035
Grams, Armin, professor of human development, School of Home Economics, University of Vermont 964
  Prepared statement 1006
Green, Alicia M., parent of a child in day care, Rutland, Vt 1066
  Prepared statement 1069

Page

Harmon, Esther, grandmother of a Head Start/day care child, member 5-C, board of directors and Head Start Policy Council, North Springfield, Vt ... 1076
Hartman, Ed., mental health school/home coordinator, Holland, Vt ... 982
Hathaway, Suzanne D., parent of a day care child, Rutland, Vt ... 1052
Heymering, Marinus, Jr., president, Vermont Child Care 1976 Campaign, Inc. ... 930
Holmes, Frederick C., M.D., American Academy of Pediatrics, St. Albans, Vt. ... 961
Jameson, Gladys B., assistant professor, early childhood and human development program, School of Home Economics, University of Vermont ... 968
Prepared statement ... 1016
Jewett, Patricia A., Swampscott, Mass., chairperson, Public Policy Committee of the New England Association for the Education of Young Children ... 986
Kennedy, Judy, parent, West Charleston Parent-Child Center-Vermont ... 1072
Kunin, Hon. Madeleine, member, State of Vermont House of Representatives ... 1108
LaBarge, Dolores, Morrisville, Vt ... 1060
LeBlanc, Roger, farmer, East Hardwick, Vt ... 1060
LeFevre, R. James, chairman, Child Advocates, Inc., Burlington, Vt ... 934
Manchester Child Development Center, Vt., Gordon Walker, chairman, board of directors, prepared statement ... 1030
Martin, Peg, member, Day Care Advisory Committee ... 942
McIntyre, Natalie, Manchester, Vt ... 938
McKee, Marion C., M.D., director, mental retardation and Neurology programs, Vermont State Department of Health ... 959
Merriam, Rebecca, parent of day care children, Morrisville, Vt ... 1056
Miller, Clarence, Mrs., parent, Morrisville, Vt ... 1057
Much, Charlottee A., director, Sugar Maple Children's Center, Inc., Rutland, Vt. ... 939
Murray, Margaret, parent of a day care child, Waterbury, Vt ... 1064
Orleans County Council of Social Agencies, Inc., Worcester, Vt., prepared statement ... 995
Ploof, Allen R., director, division of social services, Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services ... 928
Powell, Ethel, Barton Parent-Child Center, Barton, Vt ... 1074
Raynolds, Ann, director, Consumer-Controlled Community Child Care, Inc., Windsor and Windham Counties, State of Vermont ... 1080
Prepared statement ... 1086
Rupert, David J., director, Bennington-Rutland Head Start ... 948
Russell, Karlene V., Ph. D., director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Vermont State Department of Education ... 925
Sazer, Nina, State coordinator, New Hampshire Children 1976, Concord, N.H. ... 990
Seymour, Michele, parent of a child in day care, Burlington, Vt ... 1071
Stambler, Kay, parent of a handicapped child, Burlington, Vt ... 1043
Stearns, Marguerite B., Consumer Controlled Community Child Care, Inc., Springfield, Vt ... 1036
Strauss, Roger, executive director, Washington County Mental Health Services ... 985
Prepared statement ... 1024
Teare, Meredith Leavitt, early childhood consultant, Rutland Mental Health Service, Rutland, Vt ... 975
Towle, Gail, parent personnel committee, representing the Northeast Kingdom Head Start Policy Council ... 1048
Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, Joseph S. Handy, commissioner ... 993
Waite, Marrion E., Department of Mental Health, New England Task Force on Mental Health Services for Children ... 973
Walker, Patricia, day care parent, St. Albans, Vt ... 1046
Washington County Mental Health Services, prepared statement ... 1024
Weart, Joan, parent of day care children, Sugar Maple Day Care Center, Rutland, Vt ... 1077

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Articles, publications, etc.:
  Demographic Data, Rutland County, Rutland, Vt. 978
  Proposed budget, fiscal year 1975, Middlebury Day Care Center, Inc. 944
  Slide-tape presentation 930
Communications to:
Comm-Stafford:
  Stafford, Hon. Robert T., a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont, from Carole Bishop, center coordinator, West Charleston Parent-Child Center, Derby Line, Vt., April 25, 1975 954

APPENDIX A

Questions submitted to witnesses appearing on April 25, 1975, with accompanying responses, in order of appearance 1115

APPENDIX B

Questions submitted to witnesses appearing on April 26, 1975, with accompanying responses in order of appearance 1151

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1975

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1975

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Montpelier, Vt.

The subcommittee met at 1 p.m., pursuant to call, in the Pavilion State Office Building (auditorium), Senator Robert T. Stafford presiding pro tempore.

Present: Senator Stafford.

Committee staff members present: A. Sidney Johnson, professional staff member; Larry Greenberg, minority counsel; and Michael A. Francis, legislative aide to Senator Stafford.

Senator STAFFORD. Ladies and gentlemen. The meeting of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth will come to order. We are grateful that so many of you have come today and will be here later this afternoon and tomorrow, especially in view of the fact that we had to cancel the meetings originally scheduled for last weekend because of the Vietnamese question and the issues involving it in the House and Senate in Washington last weekend. To my personal extreme regret, Senator Mondale, who could have come last weekend, was not able to rearrange his schedule for this weekend. He had several other very important commitments in Washington that he could not break, so he was unable to come with us today, and the change in schedule was the reason for it. I would like to have the record show that this Senator is accompanied today by Sid Johnson who is the staff director of the subcommittee, by Larry Greenberg who is the minority counsel, by Claire Glen who is the secretary of the subcommittee, and by Mike Francis of Rutland, Vt. who is a member of my own staff assigned to the work of this subcommittee along with several others.

We will note at the outset that with the number of witnesses we have that the subcommittee like its parent committee, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, has a general rule that requests witnesses to supply their full written statement, which will appear verbatim in the record, and then do their level best to summarize the statements within 5 minutes. And we would like to adhere to that this afternoon because of the long list of witnesses who will appear in connection with this hearing on S. 626. There may not be a great number of questions this afternoon, but we would not want participants to get the impression that it is through no lack of interest in what they may convey to us. It will be due to constraints of time. The subcommittee will keep the record open for about 2 or 3 weeks after we return to Washington in order that people who have not had an opportunity to appear and testify or submit a written statement may have a chance to do so later, and, additionally, so that questions which may occur to the committee staff and to this Senator and to my colleagues after the analysis of the testimony and statements to be made here today and tomorrow we can keep the option open of submitting written questions to any of you who appear as witnesses today or tomorrow. To those written questions, of course, we would appreciate written answers to further assist us in developing as sound a bill as we can in this particular instance.

Let me, if you will indulge me, in a personal note say that this is a particularly rewarding day in my life as a Member of the Congress and I should like to take note of it. For the first time in the 15 years I have served in Washington in the Congress, I have been given this opportunity to provide the people of Vermont with a chance to talk directly to a congressional committee sitting in our State. It is a good feeling.

The major purpose of this hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth is to gain the benefit of your ideas, your experience and your advice in our effort to write a new law designed to improve our services to young people in Vermont and throughout the Nation. We want to know how you feel child day care centers should be operated and how other services for children and youth should be implemented. We seek this information as we write the Child and Family Services Act of 1975.

The need for day care centers and for youth services is, in the opinion of this Senator, no longer in question.

Today there are almost 27 million children in the United States whose mothers are working or seeking work. That amounts to 42 percent of all Americans under the age of 18.

Nearly one of every four of these children—about 6.1 million youngsters—are too young to attend school and are in need of some day care service. Research developed by the Senate Finance Committee indicates that there are only about 1.1 million licensed day care slots in the Nation for the 6.1 million youngsters who need some day care services.

While many of these children are quite properly cared for by relatives and friends of the working mothers, there is increasing evidence that many others are left unattended during the working day.

We need no longer debate the issue of working mothers. For reasons ranging from simple economics to changing roles in society, more and more mothers are working these days. For instance, in families where the husband's income is between $3,000 and $10,000 a year, 45 percent of the mothers are working. All we have to do is to look at today's prices to know the main reason for that.

We have come here today primarily to learn more about the needs of day care centers and other youth services in Vermont and places like Vermont around the country. Too often, Federal legislation is designed to respond to the needs of large metropolitan areas. Too often, the Congress does not pay enough attention to the critical needs that exist away from our big cities. We are here today to learn more about those needs and to make an effort to respond to them.

We are here today to learn how the Federal Government can best help parents, local communities, and the States in meeting these needs.

We are here today to see how we can learn to help keep this a program that is operated by local people for local people.

Now, let me welcome you again and thank those of you who have been kind enough to accept our invitations to testify here today and those of you who have come here out of your interest in this important subject. I assure you all that we have come here to learn and to listen.

The first witnesses before the subcommittee will be the Honorable Thomas C. Davis, secretary of the Agency of Human Services of the State of Vermont, accompanied by Mr. Joe Handy and Karlene Russell and Rolland Gerhart also. If you will take the witness table, the subcommittee will be grateful and ready to proceed.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Ploof is going to take Mr. Handy's place. I don't see him as yet.

Senator STAFFORD. Mr. Davis, we welcome you here and we know of your own distinguished career in State government and your heavy responsibilities in it as secretary of the Agency of Human Services, and we invite you to proceed.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS C. DAVIS, SECRETARY, AGENCY OF HUMAN SERVICES, STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you and to the committee. As you know, Governor Salmon cannot be here today. He has asked me to review this legislation and to express the opinion of the Agency of Human Services concerning the proposed Child and Family Services Act.

I would like to open my remarks by thanking all of you for being here and say that I will confine my remarks to just a few minutes and yield the remainder of my time to representatives of several offices of State government dealing directly with existing children's services in Vermont.

I would also like to offer commendation to the authors of this bill for recognizing a critical need for children's services; and for providing a philosophical framework that acknowledges and supports the role of the family as the primary focus of child development. I fully support the development of new resources which can help fill the medical, nutritional, educational, and social needs of children and families in Vermont.

The real issue however is how these new resources can best be applied to avoid duplication and overlap with existing service programs, and to prevent competition between providers and agencies.

I am concerned that we not create another layer of special purpose bureaucracy, duplicating an already complex network of Federal and State programs—in many cases each requiring State and local advisory councils, prime sponsorship, single purpose State plans, and an administrative hierarchy each with responsibility for coordinating everybody else.

Many of the programs proposed under this bill are for services already being provided through other Federal programs—title IV-A and VI—now title XX of the Social Security Act—title XI, medical assistance, for example, early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment. Mechanisms exist at both the State and local level for the

10

delivery of these programs through both public and private agencies. Clearly these resources are not adequate and are often restricted by specific eligibility requirements.

Further, because of the categorical nature of these programs, coordination of both planning and of service delivery is exceedingly difficult.

It is my hope that legislation such as the Child and Family Services Act be viewed as an opportunity to build on our current resources and to stimulate the development of new linkages among programs at the local level, rather than the establishment of another separate hierarchy of planning, administration, and program delivery.

I would like to point out the specific section of the Child and Family Services Act which provokes these misgivings.

Section 104 of the bill allows the Secretary of HEW to delegate prime sponsors—local, regional, or statewide—which he deems are capable of administering a program, which must coordinate service delivery with other public agencies, and which must have a child and family service council with responsibility for service plans, goals, budget, and for selection, renewal, and evaluations of all child and family service programs conducted in the prime sponsorship area.

I believe that in a State of size and wealth comparable to that of Vermont, proliferation of such responsibilities—even if they could be fulfilled by any prime sponsor—would be inefficient.

The planning, advisory, administrative, and delivery system proposed in section 104 would only consume resources through duplication of these functions, would not have the power to induce desired coordination, and would in fact only serve to foster competition and to destroy the admittedly fragile links with the networks responsive to other human constituencies.

I fear section 104 would allow the bypassing of State legislatures in placing authorities and responsibilities directly at the local level. There is a serious question there as to whether or not the Federal Government should be allowed to finesse State level accountability—and by implication—undermine coordination with State-administered programs.

It is also my concern that we not view this bill as a substitute or a solution to the problems of services integration and coordination.

Officials in HEW have said to me that neither Congress nor the Federal Government have succeeded in mandating services integration and coordination, and that the burden and initiative for achieving this must rest with the States. I would therefore urge Congress to seek ways in which to minimize the categorical nature of both existing as well as new programs, to begin to view the families and children we serve as whole persons, and to commit our social programs to the goal of maximizing human potential. It is only through increased flexibility in how we apply our resources and through an investment in State efforts to integrate its service systems that we can begin to meet this goal.

As a major step toward meeting this goal, passage of the oft proposed Allied Services Act could be one of the first real initiatives at the Federal level to address the problems I have cited. The act proposes incentives and offers the needed flexibility to begin to reduce the fragmentation, confusion, and redtape of specialized human services programs. While this kind of program integration has no constituency, I would urge Congress to consider this bill in the broad public interest as one of its highest priorities.

Finally, I am concerned that the proliferation of special purpose service programs amounts to only stopgap action; these programs—as their spiraling costs continually make more clear to us—cannot be a substitute for a responsible and realistic "incomes" policy for this country. Welfare reform must be our highest priority, and must not be overshadowed by other objectives, no matter how laudable.

My remarks are meant only as words of caution to those who would look to the Child and Family Services Act and similar legislation as an answer. It is not an answer, but it must be reshaped into a beginning and a stimulus for the steps we must take.

I realize with one exception, that I have not addressed specific sections of this bill. Rather, I have attempted to provide a framework for viewing it. I would like, at this point, to yield my time to some of the individuals who are directly responsible for the aspects of child care services in Vermont. Thank you, Senator.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Davis. We very much appreciate your attending this meeting and your statement, and we will welcome whatever statements your colleagues wish to make.

STATEMENT OF KARLENE V. RUSSELL, PH. D., DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION, VERMONT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. RUSSELL. Senator Stafford, all persons gathered here today, I am Karlene V. Russell and I have come to testify on behalf of the Vermont State Department of Education where I serve as director of the division of elementary and secondary education.

I am privileged to work on behalf of the children and youth of this Green Mountain State in its many communities. Current responsibilities, which I have, include service as chairperson of the Department Committee on Early Childhood Education and membership on the Vermont Interagency Council for Child Development, which was set up by the last legislature.

Representing the Vermont State Department of Education here today, I believe:

1. That the strength of the "Child and Family Services Act of 1975" is its focus on the needs of children and their families. I congratulate you on that.

2. I believe that in order to provide child services and child development programs, it is essential that the broadest socioeconomic blend of parents be included. I believe that the education system is the only one which is organized to serve all children and it has a creditable record of accomplishment.

3. I believe that education is a process whereby at any age a child can be aided to explore and interact with an enriched environment. Education must include assisting the child to develop essential skills as well as assisting him and his parents in dealing with related problems. By giving the education system its proper roles in S. 626, the act will be strengthened and both human services and education in this State will achieve a higher level of services to children and their families.

4. Of particular significance is the attention given to early problem detection programs in preschool services.

5. The provisions of this bill for use of Federal funds fit several recommendations in the recent position paper[1] (draft 1974) resulting from a 2-year study in the Vermont State Department of Education. These provisions include: (*a*) Comprehensive services—health, nutritional, social, and education; (*b*) both the Vermont paper and S.626 include at-home and in-school parent education and education for prospective parents; (*c*) both include training and education, both preservice and inservice including parents and volunteers; and (*d*) both include diagnosis, identification, and treatment of visual, speech, medical, dental, nutritional, and other physical, mental, phychological, and emotional barriers to full participation in child service programs.

It is particularly imperative that the provisions of S. 626 relating to our extensive educational and social service programs for disadvantaged and handicapped children under State and Federal programs be carefully meshed. Assurances of coordination of programs assisted under the act with other Federal assistance for child development, child care, and related programs; including title I, ESEA, titles IV and VI (title IV-A now replaced by title XX) of the Social Security Act, the Economic Opportunity Act and several housing and model cities acts is of great importance.

I would like to list signs of the times which indicate that the concepts of S. 626 are timely for Vermont and that Vermont education can be very significant to its success:

Educators, families, and communities are becoming increasingly aware that a child's earliest years are the most formative and vital in all phases of his development.

Educators, families, and other agencies are creating new patterns of collaboration in the service of young children.

The educational systems are developing comprehensive early screening programs for early identification of children's needs. They are in dire need of adequate financial support.

Interest, concern, and public demand are ready for additional preschool programs, especially in rural Vermont where the funding is the great deterent. The 50 percent of our children who are not in early programs comparable to those of kindergarten are in rural Vermont.

Home-school partnerships continue to develop with families and educators cooperating to provide better learning experiences for young children.

Vermont's very fine program in special education has an early essential education component.

Need, rather than age, is becoming the critical factor in designing educational programs and services for Vermonters.

Many variations in design, some of them home-based, are to be found in early childhood education programs with special attention in many of them to the developmental levels and patterns in children's cognitive and affective growth. Federal funding is important here.

Education for parenthood for parents and parents-to-be, including students in our secondary schools, is receiving increasing emphasis.

---

[1] Vermont State Department of Education. "Report on Early Childhood Education in Vermont." Dec. 12, 1974.

In closing, the situation in Vermont education gives new urgency to the enactment of Federal legislation to cover the areas of child and family services discussed today. S. 626 needs revision. It should be enacted only if the State education agency is given authority and responsibility for the policies, procedures, and activities in the bill relating to education.

I take the strong position along with a number of recognized authorities in the field of early childhood education that primary responsibility for early childhood programs be vested in the education system, the only system which is organized to serve all children and to assume the administrative and logistical responsibilities involved. The management system at the State level should be developed in such a way that it would articulate effectively with the parallel structure and services at the local level. We need linkages.

Congratulations and best wishes in your efforts, Senator Stafford.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Dr. Russell, for that thoughtful and candid statement. We will give it very careful consideration as we move to the point later on of a final writing of this bill. You have been very helpful to us. We appreciate it. We understand that Mr. Ploof is here. Mr. Gerhart, we would invite you to go ahead, if you care to.

STATEMENT OF ROLLAND C. GERHART, JR., DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT, AGENCY OF HUMAN SERVICES, STATE OF VERMONT

Mr. GERHART. Your representation of Vermont families in the U.S. Senate is appreciated. I am taking the opportunity as a parent and as director of the Vermont Office of Child Development to enter the following testimony at the hearing conducted in Vermont on Friday, April 25, relative to the Child and Family Services Act. I generally support the bill's intent to bring the resources of the Federal Government to States and localities in a cooperative venture and program of supporting services to children and families. States and localities must have additional resources other than those generated within States and localities to meet the cost of providing quality comprehensive child services.

While agreeing with the intent to enable States and localities through Federal funds, to meet their family and child service needs, I believe the manner and formula which includes a new and potentially awkward establishment of a network of local sponsors and intermediaries, a defect in the bill. It is not the parent participation, community control, or the desire for partnership and cooperation that is questioned, all of which is desirable but the complicated and potentially awkward system of local control proposed by the bill, which needs further study and correction.

Rather than a further diversification and distribution of the parts of a comprehensive child service program, weakened by a multiplicity of administrative bodies envisioned by the bill, I would rather see more direct support of the integration and coordination of strategic child services necessary to a comprehensive plan being strengthened by Federal moneys more securely under the control of State agencies required to act on behalf of the needs of children as they are understood by experienced professionals and found desirable and required by communities and parents.

I would propose that the bill continue to assure economically disadvantaged children and children of working mothers and single parents priority as well as those other special groups mentioned in the bill who should be subject to special treatment, but that the bill should be expanded to begin to better be seen as a Family and Child Service Act for all families and children.

The bill's interest in ending the regulatory confusion due to the differences of State, local, and Federal regulations and regulatory bodies is much appreciated and supported.

In the end however, the bill succeeds in its final form, if the bill succeeds in helping child care providers in securing facilities, renovating or constructing facilities, I would propose that the bill allow for grants rather than for mortgage insurance programs. The cost of child care services is directly related to operating expenses including very significantly the amortization of mortgages. Facility renovation or the acquisition of new facilities resulting in significant increases of fixed operating costs will be intensely inflationary since these costs will have to be recovered through the fees charged. Not only will this require more Federal money through Federal funds and other titles, but will most likely have direct consequences on parents who will pay for their child care services without assistance or subsidy from Government programs. I believe that a program which introduces grants rather than mortgages will in the long run be cost effective and conserve money. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Gerhart, for that excellent statement. We appreciate your interest and we will give very serious consideration to your advice as we consider this bill further. The subcommitee now invites Mr. Ploof, who I understand is here in behalf of Commissioner Joseph Handy of the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services. Is that correct, Mr. Ploof?

Mr. PLOOF. That is correct.

Senator STAFFORD. We invite you to proceed.

Mr. PLOOF. Mr. Handy sends his apologies for not being here. He is participating in a Developmental Disabilities Subcommittee meeting.

Senator STAFFORD. No apology is needed, and I am sure you will present his case very well.

STATEMENT OF ALLEN R. PLOOF, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES, VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

Mr. PLOOF. The Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services is a relatively newly formed department here in Vermont. We are heavily involved in services to families and children and therefore this bill is of particular interest and importance to the department. The department's Division of Social Services, which was transferred from the Department of Social Welfare, provides services to approximately 2,500 children from 1,400 families in the title IV–A day care program. This year more than 1,500 complaints of abuse or neglect will be investigated by department staff and ongoing "protective" services will be provided to an average of 500 families and 1,500 children. Care and supervision will be provided to 1,300 children in the Commissioner's care and custody. Services to this latter group include attempts at reuniting natural families, or, if that is not possible, freeing these children for adoption. The adoption unit gave 55 of these youngsters a chance for a secure home during the last year and arranged for a total of 124 adoptions benefiting both children and their new families. Additional services to families and children receiving public assistance, medicaid, general assistance, and food stamps are provided within the constraints of staff availability and resources.

It is in this latter category (resources) that this bill holds promise. There is no doubt that additional resources are necessary to meet the needs of children and families in the "economically disadvantaged" sector of our population and to begin to address the unmet needs of families and children in all sectors of society.

Drafters and sponsors of S. 626 are to be commended for attempting to address this need in a broad, comprehensive, coordinated and relatively noncategorical manner. However, some of the bill's provisions seem to this department to signal a danger of producing the opposite result from that intended, that is, further fragmentation rather than coordination, and this could act to minimize rather than maximize the potential benefits of new resources.

Specifically, the strong emphasis on lay participation in detailed program administration at both the prime sponsor and local levels may replicate the experience of the developmental disability councils which were established to bring advocacy and overall coordination to efforts in the developmental disabilities field, and to review, approve, and monitor special grant funds. The overwhelming experience of these councils was that the role of grant administrator for a relatively small amount of funds completely overshadowed the broader coordination and advocacy function. As you are well aware, attempts to legislatively change this focus are currently before Congress.

Opportunities in S. 626 for direct Federal funding of local projects and the possibility of multiple prime sponsorship with no clearly designated line of accountability within the State seem destined to stimulate competition rather than cooperation.

The idea of a new Office of Child and Family Services which will assume responsibilities of the present Office of Child Development and "coordinate all such programs within the department" may be a positive step, although if such coordination is limited to the establishment of a national Child and Family Services Coordinating Council, this is unlikely to have the kind of impact hoped for.

Perhaps the bill could be strengthened by requiring the establishment of an Interagency Council on Family and Child Services at the State level with responsibility and accountability for planning use of new resources in consert and coordination with existing programs. The Vermont legislature has moved in this direction through the creation of the Interagency Council on Child Development. This council has had a year's experience and its primary focus has been on uncovering the existing resources in the area of children's services. This council, or a similar vehicle, would be in an excellent position to assure maximum benefits to all Vermont families and children if the funding capability represented by the bill is translated into reality. Thank you.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much, Mr. Ploof. We appreciate your interest and the guidance which your statement will give to our subcommittee when we consider a final version of Senate bill S. 626, which, incidentally, is virtually the same bill as H.R. 2966 which appeared in your statement but that is the House bill, and it does have some minor changes from the Senate bill. The Chair will next invite Mr. Heymering accompanied by Ms. Ann D'Olier to come to the witness chair. We understand, Mr. Heymering, that you have a brief statement and that the committee and the audience is going to see some slides. Is that correct?

Mr. **Heymering**. That is correct, Senator.

Senator **Stafford**. We will invite you to proceed, and then when you have concluded we will hear from Ms. D'Olier.

STATEMENT OF MARINUS HEYMERING, JR., PRESIDENT, VERMONT CHILD CARE '76 CAMPAIGN, INC.

Mr. **Heymering**. Senator Stafford, I feel honored to speak to you today, at your invitation, concerning the needs of children and the proposed Child and Family Services Act of 1975. My name is Marinus Heymering, Jr., and I speak in my capacity today as president of the Vermont Child Care '76 Campaign, Inc.

The Vermont Child Care 1976 Campaign is a 2-year, nonprofit, public education campaign using the occasion of our Nation's Bicentennial to increase the public's awareness of the needs of children and to increase the public's commitment to meeting the needs of children and their families within their own communities. Because our purpose is to raise issues of public policy and to provide factual information as a basis for public discussion and public decision, we decided it would be a wise use of our allotted time to show you a slide-tape presentation developed by the campaign in the hope that it would help to acquaint you with some ways in which comprehensive services to children can be, and are being, provided in a rural State such as Vermont.

Following the slide-tape presentation, another member, Ann D'Olier, would like to share with you some of her thoughts and concerns about rural needs from her perspective as a nursery school teacher.

[The slide-tape presentation follows:]

SLIDE-TAPE PRESENTATION (18 MIN.)

Beginning of slides start with children singing the song, "Happy Birthday."

Commentary. The reality of family life today is changing as people spread out from their home towns and family roots in search of better jobs and new climates. The care of our children has always been an important part of our American heritage, and so it remains as our country approaches its 200th Birthday, the foundations of our future generations. To meet the needs of the modern American family, an entirely new concept of child care facilities is evolving. Today's child care programs are family plans. They are extensions of the care that we give our children at home. They strengthen the bond between parents and children and allow families to build more secure homes. They are the corner stone of democratic community participation and self-control. There is no single kind of child care program which will meet the needs of every type of family structure. It is up to each community to develop child care programs based on the needs of its members and the resources available to it. We visited a number of families in their homes to find out how child care programs help them. Their comments are representative of the majority of parents who are faced with a myriad of problems of family life in the 1970's.

Herb and Pat have six children. Finding enough work has not been easy for them. Lately they have been successful and have just moved into a new home.

Mary and Albert have lived in the same town all of their lives. They have just moved into an older home and are both working in order to give Stacey a variety of experiences.

Albert. We could get by without one of us working; without her working, we could get by. But it's, uh, you know, like we just had our washing machine break down on us and everything, so we want to . . . we're going to have to have a new washing machine, and that would put us back. We'd like to stay up on it so that when Stacey does go to school and everything she'll be able to go dressed right and, you know, take her bicycle there in the 2nd or 3rd year, whenever they start riding bicycles back and forth to school. And, you know, we can take her to Story Town, or something like this, and when we decide to go for a weekend we can just . . . then we'll go, and have the money enough to go.

Commentary. Brenda is a single parent. She has relatives nearby and prefers to live with her two daughters, Jody and Janie, as an independent family unit. She works for a large supermarket chain and has a very irregular work schedule.

Brenda. I might go to work as early as 8 o'clock in the morning, and I might work a 4-hour day, a 5-hour day, or I might have a full 8-hour day. Then, again, I might go to work at noon and work for four, five or eight hours, or I might go to work at 5:00 or 4:00 and work for four or five hours; so it is very irregular. I don't know from week to week or day to day what it is going to be, so I have to, you know sort of depend on somebody. And when you try to get a baby sitter, or even day care services, at first it was really hard trying to get somebody lined up for those hours because they didn't want to be tied down.

Commentary. Bob and Suzanne have been married for 15 years and they are established members of the community. They have four children ranging in age from 3 to 14. Both Bob and Sue work. Sue is able to do some of her work at home, but is never certain when she will be called in to work at the office. Even though their older children can take care of themselves, and have on occasions stayed home alone, Sue and Bob hesitate to leave them unsupervised.

Sue. The 11-year-old, Brenda, and Ernie, can stay home alone, but after awhile they get into things that they shouldn't, such as—well, once Ernie went and took the clock apart——

Bob H. That's why it isn't running——

Sue. [continuing.] Just because it was stopped and he thought he would help. And these things—I mean, they do get into things, which we don't like to come home and find.

Commentary. Bob and Meredith both pursue professional careers. Meredith's plans for Erin first four years were changed when she realized that she was happier in the role as a preschool consultant than as a full-time mother and housewife.

Meredith. When Erin was born, you know, I'd worked with kids for a long time and I vowed that I wasn't going to go right back to work. I was going to stay home for at least four years, then I was going to go back to work. And I absolutely hated staying at home. I had worked all my life, you know, and I couldn't stand it; I felt like I was a non-person sitting around the house all the time. The house got dirty, the dishes got dirty and the cooking never got done. I couldn't have cared less about communicating with a non-verbal infant.

Commentary. Chris is a former staff member at a local child care center. He attended college and both he and Alicia hold down full-time jobs in order to support their family. Jennifer entered kindergarten this fall and benefited greatly from her preschool experience at the child care facility.

[Child's Action Song at this point in film.]

All of the families with whom we talked emphasized the personal and professional attention which their children received from the staff members at the child care centers.

Alicia. They care about what is going on with Jennifer even though they got so many kids there. I always get a personal review on what Jenny has been up to. And there are things I didn't know she was doing because she doesn't do them at home, and she may just try them out at day care. You know, I find this out and it helps me to deal with my problems. You know, I have a problem disciplining Jennifer—how they do it and what can I do at home.

Herb. I've never seen teachers take so much time and patience with kids——

Pat. What impressed me was the patience that one guy down there had. There was one of the children there that picked up a chair and threw it at him, and he very calmly picked the chair up and set it back in place and said "sit there";

and he did this about four times. Me, I think I would have paddled his fanny. They have got patience—Boy, of Angels, I'll tell you.

Sue. And, as mothers can be, they wake up in the morning and if they don't feel good they are mad, so they take it out on the children. And this doesn't happen at day care because there is more than one teacher; there is two or three. Usually the children that are not particularly geared to get along with that teacher will go with another teacher.

Commentary. Brenda is fortunate in having relatives nearby. The availability of a child care program allows her to work and also frees her relatives to live their own lives.

Brenda. She is not with a member of the family, which makes a lot of difference. I think it is good that she is not with the family constantly. Because before I had my mother, one of my sisters or somebody baby sit and when you keep it in the family they sort of know who they can get around. At day care they know what they can or can't do, and they learn, you know, that they can't have their own way all the time and just because this is Grammy's house, you can do it. Day care is not run that way. There are other children and they have to learn to think of others besides themselves.

Commentary. Most families were pleased with the variety of educational and social experiences which their children were exposed to at the child care centers.

Bob H. I think most of all it is an education for the kids to get along with others, and this is a big thing. This is something you can't do yourself at home at all.

Sue. They go places that we could never even afford to take them or we don't have the time to take them because we are working to make a living just to feed them.

Bob H. This is beautiful.

Sue. They went to the circus yesterday. We wouldn't have taken them to the circus. We may have wanted to, but we would either come home too tired or the tickets are so high priced for a family the size of ours that they couldn't go.

Meredith. We would just never take them there because we would get into our own things or we would figure our garden was more important than a trip to the fire station, or something like that. And I'm not the kind of person that goes out of my way to have five kids over for the afternoon.

Commentary. Parents also mentioned the preschool program which is an important part of the activity at the child care center.

Alicia. I feel it is so important to know how to read and really have enthusiasm for learning, and that type of thing. I really think she has developed that. I mean, like, we all read anyway. I've read to her since she was like 2 months old, so that she's got anyway, but coloring and getting her to know what transfers are—I never realized that kids didn't know these things. You know, like, what a triangle is; of course you know what a triangle is.

Bob T. I don't have the knack, the knowledge or the skills as to what those little kids turn onto, so having her at the day center means she is with people who really like that age level and have spent time getting materials together. So she is getting a lot more than she could get if she were home alone with either of us.

[Child's song, "Bingo," played at this time.]

Commentary. Child care programs work in close cooperation with local agencies to make available a broader range of other services, such as vision and hearing testing and to catch and treat problems before they interfere with the child's normal development. The trained staff at child care centers can spot physical and emotional problems which the child may be experiencing, and will discuss these problems with the child's parents and offer advice or referral to the proper professional. For example, Mary was having an especially difficult time relating to Stacey. This is how the child care facility helped her.

Mary. They come to me and as a matter of fact there was her teacher, a girl from Mental Health and myself and we sat down and we had a two-hour discussion about Stacey, because they were having problems with her and I was having problems with her; and we just didn't know how to handle them. So, we got together and we told each other how we handled certain situations, and we sort of figured out what was the best way to handle some things. We decided it would take quite a bit of time. But we are always having talks about it. Every time I see the girl from Mental Health we discuss it and she will come over and ask me how Stacey is doing, and her teacher and I will stand there and talk.

COMMENTARY. The child care center also provides a well-balanced nutritional program; meals are not an extra. All of the children and staff eat together in a home-like family style setting. The development of adequate child care facilities is a task which cannot be handled by one group or government agency alone. To be responsive to the needs of each community, the development of child care facilities must be a community effort. Brenda has been actively involved in the organization and growth of one day care center, and had this to say:

BRENDA. Our day care has been run with everybody's help. The government has given us a lot of money, but we are closer in effect. We have had to work for a lot that we have gotten, too, and it has made us a lot closer and people have been able to get along easier. You know, if day care was handed to us, I'm sure that would solve a lot of problems we got.

But, really, too, if you don't have the staff and the parents and the children all working together, you've got nothing to look forward to. You're going to have a programmed day care just like other programs the government spots here, there, and everywhere; they are all going to be run the same, and I think you have to have a little bit of differential in the program. You know, by working at it you can make it work. You know, variety has done a lot for us. We have had some times when we have really hit rock bottom, but through the help of the staff and the parents and the city and everybody we really have come a long way.

COMMENTARY. Even though this center has been operating for several years, it is still responsive to the needs of the community which it serves.

BRENDA. I think that you as a parent or I as a parent, if we feel that something isn't going right, the staff is always there. The director is there; you can always talk to her and if you feel things aren't going right you have the right to go in and tell her. I mean, she is always there to listen, or somebody will listen. I don't think you could change it if it was something that was out of the way or something that just you alone felt. But if it was a general problem, changes have been made.

[Child's song played at this time.]

COMMENTARY. The availability of comprehensive child care programs has been an immense help to all of the families who we talked with. While child care programs mean different things to different families, they have become an integral part of the lives of all families who use them.

BRENDA. I feel good about it and they feel good about it. We don't think about it any more. Day care is there, we accept it, we need it, and a whole new world opened up.

COMMENTARY. It is the goal of Child Care '76 to foster the development of many different types of child care programs so that our country will have a comprehensive system of child care facilities by 1976. Let's give our children the best possible birthday present for the Bicentennial—quality child care programs responsive to local community needs to help all families to build a better America.

[End of slide-tape presentation.]

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for that very interesting presentation. Now, Ann D'Olier, would you care to address the subcommittee?

STATEMENT OF ANN D'OLIER, TEACHER/DIRECTOR, THE TOTS SCHOOL, MONTPELIER, VT.

Ms. D'OLIER. Senator Stafford, members of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, I am Ann D'Olier, teacher/director of the Tots School, a parent cooperative nursery school in Montpelier for 2 through 4 year olds, and I am speaking today from my experience as an early childhood teacher.

What are some of the characteristics of rural Vermont?

1. Many children and families live a great distance from neighbors and from the center of town.

2. The post office and general store are meeting places for exchanging ideas.

3. In the winter, people do not venture outside as often. This isolation affects both senior citizens and young children.

4. Time and energy is put into furnishing basic survival needs. People have developed skills to take care of themselves in forest environment.

5. Vermonters tend to live a slower paced and simpler life.

6. People travel great distances to jobs—most industry is in city areas. Dairy farms, orchards, farming, and maple syrup offer incomes to people, too.

How does the rural environment affect the lives of children? Children's health, especially dental care, is jeopardized due to the following: (1) Lack of services—for example, no general practitioner in Grand Isle County; (2) time and energy required to get to services; (3) greater distances involve additional costs to operate the car. Children in rural areas also lack social interaction with children their own age.

The Tots School parent cooperative was designed to meet demonstrated needs: A program for 2 year olds, fees charged on the basis of ability to pay, parents directly involved in the education of their children, and a place where children can play together with learning materials that are not readily available at home. I'd like to stress that eligibility for the program is not governed by income. It is important to set eligibility standards for programs based on the family's identified needs, rather than the family's level of income.

Our main problem at this point is lack of an adequate facility. I have heard other comments about crowded space for existing early childhood programs. I don't feel the answer to this problem lies in using empty space in public schools. No space is available in public schools in Montpelier. I provide transportation to families in our program even though there is no money in the budget for this expense.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. We appreciate your willingness to be here this afternoon. The Chair will repeat that the failure on the part of the Chair to ask questions is not indicative of any lack of interest of what is being said. It is in view of the time constraints and the number of witnesses. The Chair and the other members of the subcommittee will reserve the right to send questions in writing to witnesses who have appeared here after we have had a chance to analyze the testimony that we are receiving today and tomorrow in the hope that those who may receive them will respond in writing and further assist this subcommittee in preparing a final version of S. 626. The next witness scheduled before the subcommittee is Mr. James LeFevre of Burlington. If he is here, we would invite him to come to the witness table. He is the chairman, I believe of Child Advocates, Inc.

STATEMENT OF R. JAMES LeFEVRE, CHAIRMAN, CHILD ADVOCATES, INC., BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Thank you, Senator. Senator Stafford, members of the committee, I am pleased to appear before you today, at your invitation, to speak concerning the proposed Child and Family Services Act of 1975. My name is Jim LeFevre, and I am here in my capacity as chairman of Child Advocates, Inc. I think at this point I would like to also in terms of providing some sort of context of my statements talk a bit about the multiplicity of the roles that I do play here in Vermont.

There are several reasons why I am indeed interested in the comprehensive title and comprehensive subject matter in the Child and Family Services Act. I also speak in Vermont and work in the Day Care Advisory Committee which is a statewide organization of both consumers and providers of child care which acts as both technical advisors to and advocates for child care to the secretary of human services. I have also been youth services director at the Greater Burlington YMCA, and essentially working in programs with adolescents, and also currently work with Planned Parenthood; so I have many interests in the subject and many interests in the kinds of perspectives that this kind of legislation and the kinds of opportunities it would provide.

Today I am here in my capacity as chairman of Child Advocates, Inc. We are a statewide lobby for children in Vermont. We provide no direct services. What we do is represent the needs and interests of children before bodies such as this.

The proposed Child and Family Services Act has generated a number of controversial issues which I could explore with you, such as:

Should public school districts assume prime sponsorship for services provided under the Act? Or, alternatively, should they not be permitted to do so?

Should "for profit" agencies be eligible to provide services funded by the act?

Should funding go to the States, as under title XX, or should funding bypass the States and go directly to local communities, as is the case with Head Start?

By and large, these are questions of process rather than of substance; and, although answers to these questions may be significant to the success of the act, I prefer to address other points.

We who live in rural areas enjoy some clear advantages over our urban friends. Notably, our environment is generally cleaner and healthier, and our life moves at at more leisurely pace. I like to think that this allows us to be more in touch with life and with ourselves than we could if we lived in an urban environment. But we who live in rural areas also suffer some significant disadvantages. Many of us live alone and great distances separate us from our friends and neighbors. Our two greatest problems, which you shoud bear in mind as you consider this act, are isolation and transportation, and the special problems they cause for our children.

First, isolation. Because we are separated from each other in rural areas by great physical distances, many children have little opportunity, and sometimes no opportunity at all, to interact with their peers until they begin school. I do not know offhand of any studies that would bear me out, but I would not be surprised at all to find that rural children are significantly more disadvantaged socially, as a result of this isolation, than are their urban counterparts. Thus, I would suggest that there is a greater need for early childhood services in rural areas, particularly opportunities for peer group interaction and socialization, than there is in urban areas.

Second, transportation. We who live in rural areas have no mass transit; we must rely on the family car—if we can afford to own and operate one—or on the generosity of friends and neighbors. For many people, it is difficult, if not impossible, to travel to a particular place in order to receive a particular service. Most early childhood programs in Vermont receive no money to support the costs of transporting children served by their programs. I should mention here that many early childhood programs in Vermont do provide some transportation, but they can only afford to do so because child care workers are willing to settle for as little as $4,000 or $5,000 a year in wages and benefits. In addition, transportation costs contribute to the higher price of many items that must be brought into rural areas from other parts of the country. Thus, I would suggest to you that a rural area needs more money per capita to provide services to its population than does an urban area, particularly if rural programs are to be able not only to afford the higher costs of many necessary materials and to provide transportation to children they serve but also to pay skilled child care workers a fair and equitable living wage.

I will conclude my remarks today by noting that this is at least the third time in this decade that a bill to provide comprehensive early childhood services has been considered by the Congress. The need for such legislation has already been amply documented. I urge you not to allow this measure to suffer the fate of earlier versions, but rather to act with all deliberate speed to enact the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 in 1975.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. LeFevre. One of the earlier witnesses in concluding wished this subcommittee luck, and it was probably on the basis that we have tried twice earlier without succeeding. We may need it this time. We think we have a greater chance of success this year than ever before. We will invite the next to have a panel, a Vermont day care directors' panel. The subcommittee will invite all or any of the following who are here to come to the witness table: Mr. Daniel Albert, Ms. Peg Martin, Ms. Jane Sadler, Ms. Charlottee Much, Ms. Natalie McIntyre, and Mr. John Franzway. We will leave it to your discretion as to how you wish to proceed.

Vermont Day Care Directors Panel

STATEMENT OF DANIEL ALBERT, DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT DAY CARE CENTER, BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. ALBERT. Senator Stafford, committee staff members. I am pleased at the opportunity to speak with you today about the needs of Vermont's children and families, and about this proposed legislation.

My name is Dan Albert. I am director of the University of Vermont Day Care Center which provides, or tries to provide, developmental child care services for approximately 90 children, ages 2–6, from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds and including those with handicaps, in Chittenden County. I am also president of the Vermont Day Care Directors Association.

Vermont is a rural State, recently claiming the dubious honor of being the most rural in the Nation. Many of Vermont's needs for and experience with child care will be relevant to the needs and experience of other rural States. For example, money for transportation, the inclusion of home-based program options, and provisions for extensive training all speak to the needs of any rural population served by generally smaller, spreadout facilities.

However, Vermont is also a small State, one in which many of the people working in the same or related fields know each other, one in which central meetings are relatively easy to bring about, one in which the bureaucracy is still touchable, the redtape by and large still manageable. Therefore, Vermont's smallness, of both area and population, may set it apart in certain ways from other of the rural States. For example, a single prime sponsor might be workable here but not in North Dakota.

Furthermore, Vermont's strong tradition of fierce independence—and therefore flexibility—commonsense, hard work, and Yankee ingenuity stamps its mark on all States endeavors, and certainly differs qualitatively from the Federal presence. Thus, Vermont, like every other State in the Nation, brings its own unique perspective to the specific needs of its citizens and the best ways to meet those needs.

Vermont families need the services outlined in the Comprehensive Child and Family Services Act of 1975. The developmental approach to child care—making central the needs of children and families rather than Government or industry, on a mixed income rather than segregated income basis is something those of us in the field have long advocated, long worked and looked for in Federal legislation. It's also something we've strived to accomplish in our programs, often having to fight, manipulate or juggle State and Federal regulations in order to piece together the services needed by specific children and parents we serve. Here finally under one roof without overly restrictive income guidelines are all the services. Here finally is a mandate for coordination of existing services. Here finally is the flexibility to design on the State and local level the delivery mechanisms best suited to our needs.

However, before I get carried away into unreality in praise of this bill, let me point out four points of potential problems, some of which have been mentioned already by other persons.

One: The delivery system.—I feel strongly that the bill must remain flexible to allow a variety of prime sponsorship. No one agency should be mandated by the bill to be the universal prime sponsor. Although strong lobby forces are advocating a mandate for the Department of Education as universal prime sponsor, the criteria for prime sponsorship must remain intact and include comprehensiveness of proposal, proven ability to coordinate with other agencies, track record in general, and without prejudice for or against any particular potential sponsor. In a State like Vermont, a single prime sponsor seems possible and desirable, although some would disagree with me about the desirability of it. But it would be unwise either to require a single sponsorship or preordain who the sponsor should be.

Two: The income mix.—The importance of an income mix in all programs cannot be overemphasized. Participation should be determined by need for services not assumed as either higher or lower because of income levels. The sliding fee scale is an important component to make it possible to serve a continuum of levels, including those frequently excluded folks in the lower middle.

Three: Funding.—The amount of money proposed to meet these broad and critical range of services is obviously inadequate. Instead of a B-1 bomber program, perhaps the Congress should recognize the enormity of child and family service needs and fund this bill at $50 billion. If this allocation remains the same, I would like to suggest two points that should be included. First, a floor should be established to guarantee States with small populations, like Vermont, enough of the pie for the program to have a meaningful impact. Second, along with the Head Start guarantee which is explicitly included in the bill, there should be a guarantee that what is now the title IV-A or title XX day care services those should also be continued at not lower than the current level in each State.

Four: Administrative levels.—How many currently existing administrative structures will be consolidated by or under this bill? Although the principle of parental and community input into all programs is a crucial one, the establishment of parallel bureaucratic structures must be avoided at all costs. We've had enough duplication and waste of effort. Administrative structures like the services themselves, should build on what is already here rather than creating new mechanisms that will ultimately detract from the quantity and quality of services actually delivered.

In all, I feel the bill as it is written is a good piece of legislation. I would urge the committee to resist any efforts to limit the flexibility presently built into the bill, but also presently challenged from certain sectors. Thank you very much.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Albert. We appreciate your very helpful statement. I will invite the members of the panel to continue as you may wish.

STATEMENT OF MS. NATALIE McINTYRE, MANCHESTER, VT.

Ms. McINTYRE. I think bill S. 626 looks like a very good beginning for future children's programs in the United States. I am particularly pleased that it insures the continuation of Head Start as well as that it has provisions for built in increments for other child care programs. As my understanding of the disbursement formula indicates that Vermont may receive only $100,000 for children's services the first year, an amount less than the annual budget of some of our current day care centers, I would initially recommend the formula used for title IV-A funds be applied to this bill. Further, I would hope that some provision be included for parents' fees to be used as matching funds. The fee schedule imposed by the Federal Government on the State of Vermont is not exclusively our burden; it's unrealistic. What may be a reasonable fee scale for a family in California causes undue hardship for a Vermont family. Fee schedules should be worked out on a State level with considerations taken for a "mean" income. And I know why it is called "mean," especially in Vermont. And the area cost of living should be considered. The current expense to parents for day care in Vermont is so prohibitive that day care centers are absorbing the costs. This means a decline in income to centers causing further hardship to staff already on "starvation wages." Whatever comes out of the hide of the centers comes out of the hides of the dedicated staff members.

Vermont needs money for its child care programs, not advice, no more planning, no more studies, and no more bureaucracy. We have an effective child care delivery system in the State of Vermont now. Prime sponsorship can be assumed by the agency of human services which currently administers child care programs in Vermont. In regard to sponsorship by or any kind of supervision or supervisory role for the department of education, I feel very strongly that early childhood education must be left in the hands of those who understand the growth and development processes and the needs of young children. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Ms. McIntyre, we appreciate your statement. It's short and right to the point. Even Cal Coolidge would approve of the brevity. We will invite the next member of the panel to proceed.

STATEMENT OF CHARLOTTE A. MUCH, DIRECTOR, SUGAR MAPLE CHILDREN'S CENTER, INC., RUTLAND, VT.

Ms. MUCH. I am Charlotte Much from Sugar Maple Children's Center, in Rutland, a IV–A day care center that has been in operation for 4 years. I will not touch upon many of the components of the bill other than what I see as real taxing daily kinds of needs and frustrations that day care centers feel.

The needs of children in rural Vermont have remained unfulfilled, in spite of the long term efforts of many individuals.

In talking of the prime sponsorship, I see that the administration of funds becomes the responsibility of the State rather than having prime sponsorship on the local level with a State as small as ours. Only in this way will the moneys be allocated in a realistic manner, fulfilling the many different needs of this necessary project. People controlling the moneys must, of necessity, be the same people who actually work with children, and are aware of the most imminent needs. Too often in the past, the allocation of funds has been the responsibility of people who cannot possibly understand how these funds can be best utilized. Personnel should include persons with administrative skills, and others who have had direct experience in working with groups of young children. These persons should also have a child development educational background.

One of the most urgent needs is money to provide for realistic salaries. And, I cannot reinforce what Natalie has said, even to the degree of the impact that I wanted to come out. Because of the extreme dedication of current staff, day care continues to thrive. How long can we expect competent, well-trained people who have substantial investments in their education to exhibit this kind of dedication? Eventually, we hope that something will bring about a system so that it can go without this type of thing. A lack of adequate funding creates a large turnover in staff, which requires monstrous hours of training. There is an urgent need for more and better training and materials. Many para professionals need immediate formal classroom training, but without financial assistance, this in most instances, cannot be a reality. We should be allowed to produce training materials. Films, as an example, would be a good source of training enrichment that could be duplicated and used by many, many people. It would be a good idea also to be researching better equipment to be used by children. Research has already proven the whole area of early childhood education and development to still be in its infancy.

It has been firmly established that early childhood, the 0 to 6 years, must be explored, and utilized more adequately. Day care is in the unique position of most able to serve these needs. Other existing programs are limited to only a 2 to 3 hour day, and therefore limited, in time, in terms of what they can accomplish. Day care serves its individual community, establishing its hours to accommodate the needs of the parents and children in that location. Most centers operate a 9 to 12 hour day. This means the child must have more than custodial care. The cost of a private nursery school is way beyond the resources of many families and the direct consequence is to the child. Due to the length of the day care day, there must be realistic consideration to the actual cost per child, per day, to the center.

Once again, because of this fact alone, were it not for the extreme dedication of staff members, who provide for many unpaid hours, day care would not exist in Vermont. Programs must be funded with cost consideration given to component parts of the program, as opposed to the number of possible children divided by the number of available dollars. Cost is not the only consideration for the local level. Guidelines for actual program management, hiring and firing of staff, and regular administering of programs must be left to the local level and for local agency control.

Research has proven the whole area of early childhood incorporates the formative years, and therefore teachers must be special people. They, of all people, must be flexible for quality will only come with flexibility. The needs of children at the local level must be met when the need arises, and not years later. Traditionally education makes changes, but most often these changes occur many years after the obvious need has existed. Therefore, it is not unrealistic to state that whole generations of school children are missing many of the educational changes that in actuality were vital to their total growth and development. For day care there must be an adequate balance between custodial care and education. At this time, I see early childhood as that of being the birth of an infant. Due to a lack of change and flexibility with multiple problems, our current educational system has grown and developed into an uncontrollable monster. It is the opinion of some that coupling early childhood education into the department of education will bring about a positive influence with positive changes. However, due to the infancy stage of early childhood education if it were to be incorporated into the department of education, it is my opinion that it would literally be devoured by the education monster.

The American family is the all important nucleus of our country. Extended families, today, are no longer predominant. The nucleus family faces the dilemma locating adequate child care facilities. Day care is in a good position to fill this need. For the first time, we see here legislation directed to survival for this all important effort. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Ms. Much. For the record, could you tell us what the annual budget is for the day care center on Main Street in Rutland? If you don't have it in mind, you might supply it for the record.

Ms. MUCH. I think our 1974 budget was $125,000. The annual 1973 budget, I believe, had been $145,000.

Senator STAFFORD. How many children at the center?

Ms. MUCH. We have 200 full-time and part-time children currently enrolled and actually attending.

Senator STAFFORD. How many staff people on the staff?

Ms. MUCH. Approximately 32 full-time and part-time staff.

Senator STAFFORD. Could you give this subcommittee some idea of what the average salary might be to a full-time staff person?

Ms. MUCH. Yes. Sir, it is extremely low. It's probably an average for all supportive staff of maybe $2.15 an hour. It's ranging from $2 an hour up to I think one person is making $2.60 an hour, but most of our staff is still at approximately $2.10 an hour.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. We appreciate it. Who will be next from the panel?

STATEMENT OF JOHN FRANZWAY, ADMINISTRATOR, DAY CARE CENTER, NORWICH, VT.

Mr. FRANZWAY. I am also a member of the Day Care Advisory Committee. The purposes of the Child and Family Services Act more accurately represent the philosophy of those of us in the field than any previous legislation.

Strengthening family life has been the most significant contribution we as service professionals have made. I believe effective support of existing families precludes more radical measures such as foster care, or delinquency problems later on in life.

Of primary concern to me in the legislation proposed are several issues related to the delivery of services.

Section 104, pertaining to State prime sponsors, sets up an intermediary bureaucratic level between the prime sponsor, it is to be the State, and the service providers which creates an unnecessary layer of administration, at least in a State the size of Vermont. This intermediate level was tried in the 4–C concept and resulted in an expensive local bureaucracy unfamiliar with day-to-day problems and unable to provide solutions.

On the other hand, the provision for an advisory council on the State level, made up of provider representatives and parents, with budget and policy powers, would help to insure a responsive overall program. This provides a logical basis for decision making and would strengthen their involvement. Local agencies, also, need to be responsive and have a majority of parents on their boards or on their own advisory councils. Section 105, relating to the child and family service councils, should allow remuneration to economically disadvantaged persons required to miss work in order to participate. This is a serious problem and usually hinders participation.

In Section 106, provisions for a fee schedule should be included to aid in providing services to as many as possible. Free services should only be provided to those for whom it is impossible to pay something. Presently, many low income families using private services pay from 20 to 30 percent of their incomes for babysitting, which does not mean they can afford to, but does indicate that they can contribute something to sustain a program.

With a free payment also comes a greater interest on the part of some families for a good program. Under such a financial structure, legislation should mandate early childhood education for all children.

Education is part of child development and as such should be included. Education facilities and resources should be adapted to assist in providing early childhood services, especially in areas of so-called afterschool and summer programs for school age children.

I would suggest education assist on the preschool level in curriculum development, training, and the sharing of resources such as transportation, psychological services, health, and nutrition. However, if schools are to have a primary role in early child development they must become more responsive to child and family needs. They must consider such policies as parent boards, all-day services, 12-month programs, teaching versus developmental times, voucher plans, and tuition or fees.

With only limited funds forthcoming as this proposes, both Head Start and existing day care programs should be priority concerns as they have been successful and have progressed beyond startup problems. Rather than mandate new structures as I think is proposed here, I would encourage legislators to coordinate the bill to fit into the existing Child Development Administration. The funding is totally inadequate to justify the all encompassing objectives of the bill. In terms of Vermont, almost none of the concerns of the bill could be accomplished.

Finally, I am concerned with the equitable distribution of funds and would urge adoption of the population formula used for title 4–A funding. Thank you, Senator.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Franzway. We have one member from the panel we haven't heard from yet.

STATEMENT OF PEG MARTIN, MEMBER, DAY CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Ms. MARTIN. I can't resist telling a story from back in the dark ages during the first year of Head Start when I was running a Head Start program in Middlebury. We sent in our budget and everything was all right except for our transportation budget, which came back saying, "You are spending entirely too much money for transportation; use mass transit." To me, this has always typified some of Vermont's problems and some of Washington's problems.

It was a question as to which hat and which head to wear at this hearing. I am speaking on behalf of the Day Care Advisory Committee. We are a group of day care providers of every description, plus representatives of organizations such as the Governor's Committee on Children and Youth. We are appointed by the secretary of the Agency of Human Services to act as "advisers and advocates."

Vermont's early childhood and day care constituency is very well able to express its own feelings, but we felt, as a committee, it was important that we put in at least a word. So, here are some very general thoughts regarding the Child and Family Services Act, S. 626.

It is really good to find a piece of legislation which supports philosophically and wholeheartedly, not just grudgingly, comprehensive and developmental programs for children. I regard this as a giant step toward the dim light at the end of the tunnel. The Day Care Advisory Committee is also pleased to find this legislation firmly behind the coordination of existing resources and programs. There is only *x* amount of money, so let's make it work.

However, the Day Care Advisory Committee has strong concerns about the administrative and bureaucratic layers which would be added to an already complex structure. This seems unnecessary. Vermont's experience with similar systems imposed "from on high" has not been happy or productive. In a State this size, more than one prime sponsor will create duplication and quite possibly dissention.

Many existing agencies and day care center boards already have strong parent representation and flexibility, which is really the key. The ability and flexibility to work with local resources cannot be imposed or mandated, it must grow.

We have a basic system of services for children and families which is functioning, and should be built on. We feel this existing system should be supported and reinforced, and only then gradually expanded. If limited resources are funneled into new programs it is simply going to diminish, weaken, and possibly wipe out the good things that already exist. Not that the present system is all good, but some of it is good.

Economic reality limits the funding of S. 626 and the proposed formula makes Vermont's share "a drop on a thirsty sponge." Federal computers and statistics appear to operate only in terms of millions, which puts a State of Vermont's population at an incredible disadvantage. The Day Care Advisory Committee feels the allocation of the funds involved penalizes smaller rural States and fails to expand day care opportunities to moderate income "working poor" families.

If, in the beautiful future world of "never-never," a statewide sponsor had ample money to distribute according to criteria emphasizing coordination of existing services and the expansion of carefully considered programs, there is no one in this room who would not rejoice. As it is, let us work very hard to coordinate the child and family services Vermont already has.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for your statement, also. Is the day care center in Middlebury in one of the old church buildings there?

Ms. MARTIN. We have moved. Come see our new center.

Senator STAFFORD. The clue is that I have seen the one you were in.

Ms. MARTIN. Yes. The first time I met you was cruising through our center. We have a new center which we invite you to see when you next come to Middlebury.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you; we'll do it. Before the panel leaves, might I ask the other members if they would be willing to respond in writing to the subcommittee and address the letter to Senator Walter Mondale, who is the chairman, and supply us with the same information that I asked verbally of Ms. Much. That is, the size of your budget, the number of children, the number of staff, and the average salaries which are paid. That would be very helpful to the subcommittee. I will say to the last witness that her remarks about the equitable distribution of funds has not gone unnoticed by this Senator. We have had some success in securing equitable treatment for small States in other areas, and we will certainly see if we can't have it here. And the Chair wants to thank all members of this panel for your very helpful statements in assisting us with writing a fair final bill. We appreciate it. Thank you.

[The information referred to and subsequently supplied follows:]

MIDDLEBURY DAY CARE CENTER INC.
BOX591 5 WATER STREET
MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT 05753

May 14th 1975

Enclosed is the proposed budget of the Middlebury Day Care Center, Inc. for FY '75. At the time I testified on S626 you suggested sending a copy. I am also inkluding our last monthly statement, which gives a pretty graphic and not particularly encouraging picture of our financial status. This is pretty much the situation of most centers our size (licensed for 35 children) which serve a mixed income group.

It is easy to see our largest and most reliable source of income comes from Title IV-A funds. The Middlebury Center has a sliding scale of its own which is applied to families who do not qualify for Title IV-A scholarships and cannot afford full tuition ($34/wk.). The burden of making up the difference between parent fees and actual cost falls entirely on the center. Some months we make it, some we don't.

The wages speak for themselves, and what they say doesn't bear repeating in polite company. We have not been able to afford health insurance; it is one of our first priorities come the revolution.

PROPOSED BUDGET FY '75

INCOME	
INTEREST	100
REVENUE SHARING	7000
CASH CONTRIBUTIONS	2500
PARENT FEES	5500
FOOD REIMBURSEMENT	5500
TITLE IV-A	39000
APARTMENT	2000
FUNDRAISING	3600
	65200

EXPENSE	
SALARIES	46070
SERVICE S	2037
UTILITIES	2260
SUPPLIES	
OFFICE	800
MAINTENANCE	1370
EDUCATIONAL	700
FOOD	5500
APARTMENT COSTS	300
MORTGAGES	6845
EQUIPMENT	650
	66532

BREAKDOWN OF SALARIES	YEAR	MONTHLY TAKEHOME
EMPLOYER FICA	2600	
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	910	
DIRECTOR	7400	466.82
ADMINISTRATOR	6400	431.72
TEACHER	5200	354.02
TEACHER	5200	354.02
TEACHER	5200	346.08
TEACHER	2600	208.54
HOME-SCHOOL CO-ORDINATOR	4160	305.70
CUSTODIAN	1200	84.28
COOK	5200	320.94

MIDDLEBURY DAY CARE CENTER, INC.

NOTES ON STAFFING

Administrator and home-school co-ordinator work 4/5 time, one teacher is ½ time, custodian works one day per week.
Employees are covered by workmans compensation and unemployment insurance: there is no health or life insurance provided.
Employees are entitled to four weeks of paid vacation and two weeks of paid sick leave annually. They are expected to attend evening staff meetings, specified training sessions, conferences, and to help on certain fund-raising activities.

In addition to the paid staff, the Center is blessed with the following:

1 full time CETA employee
1 full time CVWT employee
1 full time volunteer
1 Project for Human Development employee (20 hrs)
1 GA employee (20 hrs)
3 Neighborhood Youth Corps employees (10 hrs each)
1 part time RSVP worker
5 part time volunteers from Middlebury College
5 parents who provide special weekly programs

MIDDLEBURY DAY CARE CENTER, INC.
5 Water Street, Middlebury, 388-2853
Financial Report as of APRIL 30, 1975 (FY 1975)
FY 1975 (1 Sept. 1974 - 31 August 1975)

86 % of FY 75

INCOME	Month	Year to Date	FY 75 Budget	% Receivx
301 - Interest		17.36	100	17
302 - Revenue Sharing Trans.		100.00	7000	.6
303 - Cash Contributions	167.14	2120.34	2500	85
304 - Parent Fees	680.30	4702.60	5500	85
305 - Food Reimbursement	549.60	3597.78	5500	65
306 - Title IV-A	3462.38	27170.15	39000	70
308 - Apartment	200.00	1200.00	2000	60
309 - Fund Raising	24.25	3041.06	3616	80
CETA	679.44	2092.44		*
TOTAL	5763.12	44,042.63	65,216	67

EXPENSE	Month	Year to Date	FY 75 Budget	% Spent
401 - FICA	238.52	1727.17	2600	66
402 - Vt. Unemployment	117.32	256.33	910	28
403 - Director	616.66	4933.28	7400	66
404 - Administrator	[illegible]3.32	4266.56	6400	66
405 - Teachers	2[illegible]47.58	13431.81	17975	70
406 - Cook	433.32	3466.56	5200	66
407 - Custodian	100.00	800.00	1200	66
408 - H.S. Coordinator	346.66	2496.62	3813	66
409 - Casual Labor		105.50		*
501 - Professional Services	4.00	36.00	200	18
502 - Health Services		34.00	50	70
503 - Insurance		315.00	500	63
506 - Transportation		451.18	500	90
507 - Taxes			787	
601 - Electricity		242.65	360	66
602 - Heating Cost	231.38	1222.03	1200	*
603 - Water		122.47	180	66
604 - Trash	10.00	70.00	120	58
605 - Telephone	62.22	248.55	400	60
701 - Office Expense	17.09	130.82	800	16
702 - Maintenance	103.92	600.89	1370	48
703 - Educational Supplies	8.22	281.03	700	40
704 - Food	504.39	2922.96	5500	55
800 - Apartment		332.92	300	111
Mortgage (Coop S & L)	221.30	1770.40	2655.60	66
Mortgage (Vt. Housing)	176.00	1451.50	2200	66
Furnishings & equipment		612.62	650	90
Building improvements		139.95		*
Property taxes				
Other VHIF	450.00	1350.00	2000	67
Other				
TOTAL	5818.90	43352.71	65,975.60 ~~63,320.60~~	66
GAIN OR LOSS	- 55.78	+ 689.92		

A. Cash on hand at end of month:	
Regular checking	365.97
Revenue sharing checking	70.96
Regular savings	719.98
Revenue sharing savings	100.00
TOTAL	1255.91

B. Expected Income next month from:	
Title IV-A	3500
Parent fees	500
Other CETA	650
TOTAL	4650

C. Bills Due:	
MAY 15 salaries	4279.04
Mortgage - Co-op	221.30
Mortgage - Vt. Hsing	176.75
TOTAL	4677.09

D. Projected Expenses or Debts:	
[illegible] BILL	790
TOTAL	

Recommend that:

Senator STAFFORD. The next panel will be a panel of Vermont Head Start directors: Mr. John Bloch, Ms. Lucy Hurlburt, Mr. David Rupert, and Ms. Annette Babcock. If they are here, all or any of them are invited to come to the witness table. Members of the panel, we appreciate your presence. As we did the last panel, we'll invite you to proceed as you may wish and in whatever order you prefer amongst yourselves.

Panel of Vermont Head Start Directors

STATEMENT OF ANNETTE BABCOCK, DIRECTOR, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Ms. BABCOCK. Senator Stafford, and members of the committee. I am Annette Babcock, director of the Champlain Valley Family Development Corp. This corporation is a delegate agency of Champlain Valley Office of Economic Opportunity, Inc. delegated to run the Head Start programs in Chittenden, Addison, Franklin, and Grand Isle Counties. Although I am rather new in this position I have spent the past 5 years growing with the Head Start program, first as a parent of a preschool child, and later being employed and working up the career ladder.

With the growing hard times we are in right now, I see a great need for quality child care services and a need for expanded services for families who do not qualify and cannot pay for quality services. Coming from a low income background and working within present eligibility guidelines I see children and families turned away because they make a few extra dollars, get a better job, or a one-parent family marries. Who suffers when we have to say, "You're no longer eligible. You'll have to pay for the services." The answer is the child, of course, because the parent cannot begin to pay for these services. Low income families do need to be protected because of their many needs, but let's also take a hard look at those families who are trying to keep or get their heads above water.

DELIVERY OF SERVICES

State Government and the public school system have not proven to us working in the O–5 programs that they have the capability, sensitivity, or the flexibility to work with families to provide for their needs or allow them to make policy decisions. Parents have been more often than not looked on as intruders in many of our school systems.

Because of economic times there is a surplus of teachers, and retraining does not necessarily mean they are the right person to deal with young children. Parents and community people who come from the child's own environment I feel are providing some of the best care at minimal wages because they are dedicated people. A piece of paper which says one has a B.A. or is a certified teacher does not insure this is the right person to deal with young children. In order to protect the people now working with our children, I would suggest that any retraining of teachers be competency based.

Prime consideration should be given to agencies and organizations that have been working successfully with people while insuring quality. The Head Start model has been successful in outreach and in parent participation, and it should be built upon. This is only a beginning.

I cannot stress how important it is that parents' rights be protected particularly in the decisionmaking process. I believe parents from all backgrounds care about what is happening to their children and know them best. But within our society, parents especially economically disadvantaged parents, have not been encouraged or allowed to take part in decisionmaking. This needs to be nurtured by participating in classroom and program activities, opportunities for employment and training, and organizing groups that are meaningful for them as well as decisionmaking. Parents should become the expert.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Ms. Babcock. Which member cares to be next?

STATEMENT OF DAVID J. RUPERT, DIRECTOR, BENNINGTON-RUTLAND HEAD START

Mr. RUPERT. I would like to formally thank you for the invitation to testify before your Subcommittee on Children and Youth in regard to the Child and Family Services Act of 1975.

I am currently director of Bennington-Rutland Head Start, a program located in southwestern Vermont. This program is administratively responsible for 60 Head Start preschoolchildren and families, 30 day care children, ages 3 through 7 and 25 parents and children ages 2 through 4 of a parent-child revenue-sharing project.

My background as a Head Start director, a Head Start teacher, chairman of Bennington County Early Childhood, Inc.—a local 4–C committee—a VISTA in rural Alabama, and a part-time aid to a congressional staff should enable me to make realistic comments about the proposed legislation before us.

I should like to discuss four aspects of the legislation: prime sponsorship, the particular needs of rural areas, program standards and evaluation, and training.

One: Prime sponsorship.—I see this provision as being crucial to the entire legislation and whether it could effectively bring about the statement of purpose:

> To provide a variety of quality child and family services . . . in a manner designed to strengthen family life and to ensure decision making at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served. * * *

The proposed legislation allows almost every conceivable organization to attempt to disguise themselves as qualified prime sponsors. Currently, few organizations work or involve themselves in programs dealing with preschool children. In Vermont, Head Start programs, day care programs, private nursery schools, and a few scattered organizations deal on a day-to-day basis with preschool children ages 0–6. Child care advocacy groups discuss and advocate, State agencies license, colleges train, and councils coordinate and disseminate information. This plays an important part in delivering child care services. However, these groups do not deal with the day-to-day program hassles, daily staff training and supervision, parent involvement, building crisis, and the bus breaking down. And in the end, I believe this is where the bulk of money and effort should be directed. The actual providers of services, past and present, should be looked to as the most likely prime sponsors. The route for the money should be direct and not passed through a bureaucratic maze of agencies, councils, boards, and subcontracts. New legislation brings out immediate "new" experts to grab for the money.

Groups, organizations, and agencies without a proven documented record of administering preschool programs geared to provide early childhood development skills and strong parent involvement in program decisions will most likely spin wheels and waste money.

I feel local providers or agencies sponsoring these providers can best be prime sponsors for two additional reasons besides the past experience in the field. These are parent control and geography. I can think of two possible "prime sponsors." The State of Vermont itself, along with its specified office designated to be responsible for child development, and either the local school districts or the State Department of Education. Under the proposed legislaton, they both could qualify and be accordingly designated.

The State of Vermont and the Office of Child Development fail on parent control and geography. They are too large, too removed from the action, and too unresponsive to administer child care programs. I think of the administration of the family assistance program—FAP—pretest program from 1970 until 1973, the current status of and local support for the sagging day care program, the delivery of the medicaid EPSDT—early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment—health program and the paltry budget of the Agency of Human Services as reasons to support this position. All have been or currently are mismanaged, under funded, administratively overstaffed, unresponsive to local program needs, and nonsupportive of parent control in local decisions.

The geography of Vermont encourages local decisionmaking. To force staffs, boards, parents to travel to Montpelier for decisions or attendance at policy committee meetings seems senseless and a tremendous waste. The time and money for this type of administrative overhead could and should never be allowed to occur.

Local school districts and the State Department of Education miss the mark on parent control. Currently, school systems do not concentrate on preschool children. There is no mandatory kindergarten for Vermont children. Local school districts make this decision themselves.

The compulsory age for children to attend school is 7 years of age. In many instances, they are 3 to 7 years too late in working with children's needs. Preschool children do receive "compensatory" education through title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. However, this is truly "compensatory" with no emphasis or ability to remediate and work developmentally with a large number of preschool children.

The Department of Education does grant money for essential early education programs which is in reality, special education funds. I cannot see these legislative funds and programs administered in the same manner as special education funds requiring a large degree of uniformity in an approach for basic program plans. The final standards and results should be uniform for the legislation. The various methods and approaches should be determined, set up, and carried out by the local prime sponsor, not a large State agency far removed from the teaching model utilized.

Local school districts and individual schools are many times evasive about parent's making decisions or controlling the school board. School boards throughout Vermont have little consumer control over their policies. Parents are seldom welcome in a school building or classroom except for formal, traditional parent-teacher conferences. Preschool-children are made to "pass" a test for admittance to kindergarten and parents are told to have their child remain at home "to mature" for another year. These actions only reenforce the mistrust and resentment parents have for a school system.

In essence, I strongly favor the most local type of prime sponsor possible, a prime sponsor that can demonstrate and has demonstrated expertise and involvement in the field of preschool education and parent involvement throughout their program.

Two: Rural areas.—Rural areas are not urban areas. Their needs are vastly different and the manner in which rural needs are met is vastly different than meeting urban needs. I cannot emphasize this point enough.

The application of regulations in rural areas must be "creatively flexible." There might need to be different types of regulations for rural areas. There definitely needs to be different schedules for funding of rural areas. The per pupil cost is always higher in rural areas due to transportation, smaller units of children utilizing a center and overlapping costs of heat, light, classroom material to maintain more centers. Within our own Head Start program, centers in Fair Haven and West Rutland have been consolidated into Rutland due to this high cost of operating in a rural area. The need for programs exists in these communities, yet we cannot deliver the services due to the cost. In determining appropriation levels, do not underfund rural areas or the needs will simply not be met.

Vermont and most of New England, like other rural States, lack large sophisticated governmental structures. Small town units govern. This atmosphere gives character, uniqueness, local control and individuality to a town and its people. This phenomena should not be undermined by large "catchment" areas of census units being a requirement for grant reception. Regionalization, although sometimes administratively reasonable and more efficient, does not answer the operation of a program. And, finally, let us not create a competitive atmosphere of town versus town, region versus region in applying regulations of prime sponsorship in rural areas. The criteria of eligibility and catchment area should be clear and concise so this type of destructive competition is avoided.

Three: Program standards and enforcement.—The legislative purpose states, "to provide * * * quality child and family services * * *."

Standards of performance should be high. Expectations of grantees should be clear, precise and understandable. Expectations should be directly in relation to the amount of money provided. Do not expect a center to deliver quality services while not providing staff members with comparable wages to other segments of the economy. Governmental operations continually lose qualified, motivated, capable and industrious individuals simply because they cannot live on the wages they receive.

Enforcement of these standards should be uniform and definite. If a grantee does not meet the standards after adequate time and training, they should no longer be the grantee. To continue to fund an incompetent program is unfair to children, families, and communities.

Four: Training.—Staffs need ongoing, thorough, and varied training to meet the demands of preschool education. One model of training is only limited to its effectiveness. One trainer is limited in his or her ability and versatility.

Training should be flexible, with an emphasis on increasing competency at the center. Supplementary training is a nice complement, but if job performance and child care practices are not improved and upgraded by the training, then the money is misspent.

An agency designated to provide training should demonstrate a particular strength and deliver this area of training. One agency cannot meet all training needs. The legislation states that training shall "* * * be conducted by any agency * * *." Vague and open-ended wording such as this only allows vague and open-ended training producing sloppy results.

And, finally, training should be available for all staff, whether nondegreed or degreed. To assume that a college degreed person should not continue to receive training puts mediocrity in the program at the onset. Training must be geared to each staff member and parent to really accomplish the task. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. We thank you, Mr. Rupert, for a very helpful statement. Mr. Block, I guess you are the remaining member of the panel who has not testified, and we would invite you to proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN BLOCH, DIRECTOR, ORLEANS COUNTY COUNCIL OF SOCIAL AGENCIES, INC., WORCESTER, VT.

Mr. BLOCK. Through an administrative oversight on my part, I neglected to affix my name to my testimony. It was not because I did not wish to claim authorship for it, I assure you. In the interest of time, since you have the written statement, I would like to submit that for the record and speak to some other matters that come to mind.

Senator STAFFORD. Without objection, we will make your entire statement a part of the record, and you are invited to discuss any other matter you wish that is relevant to this inquiry.

Mr. BLOCK. I think that there are a number of areas that might prove relevant, and it is with heavy heart that I bring up some of the "dirty laundry." I do it because this is a very important piece of legislation, and there has been a lot of discussion around it, and there have been a lot of positions assumed around this legislation for purposes other than investing in our future. None of us are immortal and therefore the future is our younger children.

I feel on the national level that we have consistently been "eating" our children, because our priorities are somewhat topsy-turvy. Unfortunately, that malaise extends to the State of Vermont.

I have with me, and I don't know if your committee has seen a copy of it, a report titled "Day Care in Vermont" by Eileen Siedman. I believe your office sometime ago was instrumental in getting this report released. It is curious that some of the institutions and individuals noted in that report, which did not exactly lay laurels on said institutions, have come before this committee with the grandiose notion that they could make another try at the "public till."

It is my distinct impression, Senator and other members of the panel, that there is a blatant and well thought out position on the part of Government in this State against meaningful consumer input and control. I listened very closely to the official positions presented today and I did not hear an advocacy insofar as the 51 percent of policy councils being made up of consumers, that is, parents.

By way of background, I have worked for the last 10 years in policy councils that are 51-percent consumers. It's not all a bed of roses; there are a lot of hard knocks. It is not always efficient. But it is an attempt at the reestablishment of the democracy in operation rather than theory. Our educational institutions in this State are woefully lacking in doing other than preaching about participation and democratic decisionmaking. It is a small wonder that we find that in our last general elections in this country we had a very poor turnout. I think if we are serious about parents being the models for their children and those children seriously taking those models and living them that whatever the internal content of a Child Development and Family Services Act may finally be when it comes out of the United States Congress, it must contain that proviso in the current proposed legislation for the control of the program by the consumer, that is the parent who has the child in that program.

We have a notorious track record in this State of not getting EPSDT off the ground, and every bureaucrat points to every other bureaucrat and says, "It was Charlie that dropped the ball." Now, I'm not up for pointing fingers, but 3 years after it is mandated, Senator, it seems to me we could get on with the job, with regard to EPSDT.

We ended up in Head Start with a special allocation to try to unlock some of the bureaucratic "bungling and insensitivity" that surrounded this program specifically designed to deal with high risk children in ages 0–18 under title XIX, now title XX. We have been met primarily with a stone wall in the screening process for health needs by SRS, the State and the State health department. Where we OCCSA have been able to arrange for health care delivery, parents have been astounded that something finally came out of the pipe.

We OCCSA have had similar experiences with the day care where we ended up with "child storage," or euphemistically known as custodial care. I suggest it would have been cheaper to rent racks at a Greyhound terminal and put the children in it. We have got to stop kidding ourselves about the importance of this investment and what it holds for ourselves, for our State and for our country. I think we need to look at the allocation of moneys whereby 80 percent of current Head Start financing goes to urban areas, when 40 percent of low income people in this country reside in rural America. It costs us an enormous amount to maintain our program in the Northeast kingdom—heat, light, fuel, transportation, et cetera—and, yet, I have seen no effective way of having the State enter into participation in resolving some of those problems. Therefore, I am a little taken back that they have suddenly developed such a keen interest in children and their families' problems. We do not have practitioners there today but we sure have a long line of theoreticians.

I hold the view that Vermont is basically built around the doers and the practitioners, not the theoreticians. Thank you very much for hearing me, and I will be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Bloch. The fact that we may not ask questions at this time, as I have said earlier, doesn't indicate a lack of interest. You may very well find some written questions from this Senator or from other members of the subcommittee within the next week or 10 days. Your statements have been very helpful and very direct. We have one question, Mr. Rupert, for you. That is, in your testimony you have addressed some of the vague language of the proposal in the bill, or proposals. If in writing you cared to supply to the subcommittee any specific recommendations for changed language and could do that within the next couple of weeks, it would be much appreciated. So, with appreciation to all members of the panel in your assistance to us in writing a final version of this bill, we will say thanks a lot. In the interest of democracy, the Chair is considering a 5-minute break for people to stretch a leg and get a breath of air. If you would like that, we will do it. Would you like that? The Chair will recess for 5 minutes then.

The Chair wishes to make part of the record a statement received from Ms. Carole Bishop, center coordinator, West Charleston Parent-Child Center a part of the record at this point.

[The information referred to follows:]

April 25, 1975
Derby Line, Vt.

Senator Robert Stafford
Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

At this time I would like to present written testimony that I feel is pertinent to the proposed Child and Family Services Act. My two main concerns are the delivery of services to families, most specifically the availability of services to families in a rural setting, and provisions for training staff members, as well as protecting their rights as employees. Much of the information presented here has been gleaned from actual experience, or from talking with staff members of the Parent-Child centers and other community agencies.

What concerns me most about the attempts made by the Parent-Child centers in coordinating services for their enrolled families is the patch-work effect of delivery. Either services are duplicated several times by agencies that may not realize that others in the community offer the same service, or the service is offered inadequately or not at all. Due to confidentiality rulings, agencies are not allowed many times to give out names of clients to other agencies, even when those agencies have clearly demonstrated a desire to provide services to said clients. For example, our center enrollment is down. We have tried to enlist the aid of other agencies to supply us with names as referals. Often we are told this is not possible because of confidentiality rulings. Many agencies are not aware of other community services that could be used by their clients and as a result, do not refer them to these agencies. Many times, families are served by more than one agency, each agency ignorant ofthe other's involvement with the family. This leads not only to waste and duplication of services, but also confusion and sometimes down-right advantage-taking on the part of some families. Many agency staff members I have talked with deplore this kind of confusion and cite lack of cooperation and patch-work funding operations (whichoften leads to competition between agenicies that should work together) as major causes. As mentioned above, several different agencies may be working on the same "case", yet the staffs will never meet to discuss the family or work out together a coordinated effort to meet the family's needs. An attitude of "we're too overworked to help this family so you do it" also prevails, whether the agency that has been designated as "helper" has the resources to help that family or not. Recently, despite many pleas on our part for some sort of Mental Health care for a mother in our center (who has a history of requiring and receiving such care) were ignored. We at the PCC were told we could handle her, so we did as best we could until she made an attempt to take her life. Then we demanded and obtained for her the care she needed. This neglect was not malicious or intenitonal. Yet I see no excuse for it, no matter how busy the agency considers itself.

Not only are services patch-work and insufficient, often in a rural setting they are non-existent. Recently, a trained pediatric physical therapist (who did some workshops recently for Headstart/PCC staff) volunteered her services in the home to several area low-income parents of cerebAl palsey and brain-damaged children. She could not find work with any agency, hospital, etc. because most had contracted for services with a physical therapy group that repeatedly told her there was no work available with them and to go into private practice (which she cannot afford to do). Meanwhile, there is such a pressing need for her services that she is doing work on a volunteer basis , because "I would rather work for nothing and have it get done than see it not being done at all". A valuable and dedicated professional, in an area that desperately needs the service, and who "needs the money as much as anyone else", working for love and to keep busy because there is no available space, equipment or money for her.

If you think getting services to families is hard, we have had the devil of a time providing inservice, credited training for our staff, despite the fact that it is an objective in this program, with funding provided for this purpose. Staff morale and self-confidence suffer as a result. The main schools in the area that could offer such training are one or more hours away from centers and staff homes, making it difficult if not impossible for staff with families and other duties, to attend. Our attempts to go through our local branch of Community College have consistently met with hitch after hitch, resulting in nothing being done about training. Resources in any sort of job or academic training are well-nigh non-existent to either staff or parents in the majority of cases.

Morale is also low because of the consistently shabby way PCC staff have been treated by the CAP agency, their own administrative staff and even sometimes by the families they serve. Staff members feel they have no voice in policy or decisions made concerning their program. They have defeatist and pessimistic attitudes because of this. Often they have not been asked to volunteer for certain tasks (such as transporting families and attending evening Low Income

Association meetings) but have been told they must perform or lose their jobs. These demands precluded staff members having any lives of their own, and involved overtime work for which they were not paid. Staff members have been subject to arbitrary dismissal from their jobs, placed on job probation, to shifts in job location without prior warning, without knowing if such changes were justified and without chance to dfend themselves. They feel no group, union or grant clause speaks in their behalf and they are right. They don't even have the benefit of a contract to fall back on. If placed in a threatening position, no matter how unjustified, they make little or no attempt to defend themselves. All this tends to make them hard to work with sometimes, since they are somewhat resistant to change and to put forth any effort other than essentially required. In some cases, this lack of motivation is inherent and persistent, in others due to years of nagging, brow-beating and low self-esteem. Since all center staff members are low-income members of the community (except for University Year for Action students and the coordinators) these people, who have had as little educational opportunity and chance at jobs as the families they serve, have been shoved around by administrative staff on the PCC and CAP levels and sometimes by other agency staff as well. I find it ironic that in a program dedicated to the low-income family, that staff members are treated this way. I guess these jobs automatically are supposed to raise self-esteem and educational status with no other effort on the part of the program than to provide the job. It seems that staff members are supposed to be so grateful to have these jobs that they should do anything to keep them(including, at one time in the program's history, taking families grocery shopping day or night, any day of the week). The sad thing is, through fear and not willingness, they have done anything.

In conclusion, I hope that the Senator agrees that all families and ALL children, regardless of race, creed, color, marital status, geographic location and socioeconomic level, deserve quality services and quality staff to deliver these services.

I hope this statement gives the Senator some insight into the needs of rural programs and the families they serve. My staff and I would be happy to talk with you at any time.

Sincerely,
Carole Bishop
Carole Bishop
Center Coordinator
West Charleston Parent-Child Ctr.

RECESS

Senator **Stafford**. The subcommittee will come to order. The Chair is gratified to see that Dr. Marion McKee and Dr. Holmes are both here representing the American Academy of Pediatrics, and we invite the doctors to proceed in whatever order they care.

Panel of Vermont Members of the American Academy of Pediatrics

STATEMENT OF MARION C. McKEE, M.D., DIRECTOR, MENTAL RETARDATION AND NEUROLOGY PROGRAMS, VERMONT STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Dr. **McKee**. I appreciate the opportunity, Senator Stafford and members of the committee, to comment on the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the United States Senate. My comments will be made as a fellow of the Academy of Pediatrics, but also as well as director of the mental retardation and neurology programs of the Vermont State Department of Health. It is my responsibility not only to see that handicapped children receive adequate, comprehensive and coordinated care, but to seek ways to prevent these conditions.

The scope of this legislation is, indeed, broad and has the potential for great good. And I am particularly pleased that the writers recognize that "the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children" and that it is the intent of the bill "to build upon and strengthen the role of the family." I think as an aside, too often both medical people and others intervene and attempt to take over and be the family or the parent where we need to work with parents in sometimes many difficult situations.

In a rural State, as well as urban, there are many services currently offered to young children. I think the remarks in this paragraph reiterate what has been said not only by Tom Davis, but many of the other speakers, in the importance of coordinating this act with others and other groups. Head Start, day care, parent action groups, EPSDT, home health agencies, mental health groups, public health nursing services, crippled childrens services, maternal and child health services, et cetera are all doing parts that are incorporated in this bill. And, at the present time, there is some duplication of services and at other times the needs aren't being met. I think there very much needs to be coordination so that all of the services are gotten to the children. I think it is vital that the new agency, if it exists as such, not just start a new program, but be required to know what else exists in a community and then coordinate and cooperate to get a bigger job done better.

I had some concerns and I wondered who would have the responsibility of evaluating the program, its goals, and assessing its successes or failures. Who will have the responsibility to help with changes to insure better programs and to insure good coordination? As I read the bill, I didn't feel that the local child and family service councils could do this. They would be very part-time and would not have the time nor probably the know how of how to do it, although I am sure they ought to be involved in that process. So, basically, as the other speakers have asked, who is going to be responsible to see that it is done well, that it is done with cooperation and the quality is good?

Because our populations are small, there are areas where perhaps an appropriate percentage would not meet the so-called economically disadvantaged criteria; we have very small percentages of Indian and some of the other minority populations. Because of my own bias in working with handicapped children, I would like to see mildly handicapped children included in this program, even, in some instances, if both parents are not working or economic situations do not warrant it. Perhaps a sliding scale would permit this. These children are a strain upon families because of their constant care, mothers and siblings alike need a break, the children need the education and socialization that could be gained at such a center; and the parents need help and guidance with their rearing.

In Vermont, as in other areas, I am afraid professionals have given parents the idea that they do not know how to raise their own children. This is not true and parents need to be involved more and more in child rearing at home and in the centers. I see in this legislation many good ways of doing this. Under supervision, high school students might learn first hand what good child rearing is all about. I would have one word of caution, however. These centers ought not to be used for the employment of adults with behavioral or emotional problems needing work therapy. In other words, these ought not be rehab centers for people coming out of mental institutions. A child's personality is well formed by age 3 and at least 75 percent by age 5, so those caring for him in his younger years need to be very well balanced, warm, well integrated people, regardless of their socio-economic standing.

Again, because our population is scattered, these centers ought to be broad enough to include school age children after school, perhaps during vacations or for summer programs. And where there is need, they ought to augment not only educational but recreational, social and medical needs. Again, a plea for those whose income just misses the "economically deprived" and actually become much more deprived than those so designated.

We in the health department, and I am speaking primarily of the handicapped children services, give direct comprehensive service for certain problems, regardless of the ability to pay. We do not feel we can discriminate when other services are not available on a private basis. Those families who can, do provide a measure of payment where possible. In this program I see certain similarities. The Child and Family Services Act could be a major service agency, perhaps coordinating and contracting with other agencies for other parts of the total service. However, to do this, the financial standards would have to be slightly different than set up in the bill, or perhaps the definition of "handicap" could include not necessarily the child's handicap but perhaps maternal emotional illness or maternal mental retardation, as well as the handicap within the child himself, so that the child might be able to receive services because the parents were unable or needed help to give these services.

I think this bill has great potential for helping both parents and children, and in preventing secondary illness and handicaps.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much, Dr. McKee. Dr. Holmes.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK C. HOLMES, M.D., AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS, ST. ALBANS, VT.

Dr. **Holmes**. Senator Stafford, Before I begin, I have a few comments. I am beginning to feel like a "Polyanna." For instance, in our county, we are very proud of the centers that take care of our preschool children and feel that they do an excellent job. The parents in our area do have a considerable impact in the management of the school boards. It seems apparent that most of the people who are here today seem to be a little bit restless with some of the more complex forms of our Government. Obviously, you can make most whatever you want out of this piece of legislation, depending on what your hangups are. I don't think it is just a Day Care bill. I think it has much greater potential.

I am Dr. Fred Holmes. I am a fellow of the American Academy of Pediatrics. I am president of the Franklin County Medical Society and president of the Franklin County Pediatrics Health Council. I am a member of the faculty of the Department of Pediatrics with the University of Vermont College of Medicine, and I am consultant for the Head Start programs in our area. My big job is that I am in the private practice of pediatrics in St. Albans. The area I serve is small, rural, and in some difficulty financially, with, I believe, the highest unemployment rate in our State. But I must add that we seem to be in a bed of roses compared to some of the things I have heard here this afternoon.

I doubt that anybody could in good conscience question the importance of the bill we are discussing here today. Because of their inability to stand up for their own rights, many of our children are in a singularly vulnerable position, and tend to rely upon us to assure the health and security for their future. While parents may or may not choose to accept programs or suggestions for their own health, children may find themselves born to a socio-economic situation, certainly not of their own choosing, which may not afford them the optimal opportunities for their own development.

I would first like to suggest that the primary importance of this legislation should not be to assure healthy children as much as it should be to help these children grow up into healthy parents for their own children. The difference in emphasis may be slight, but as Mr. Mondale suggested in referring to the cost effectiveness of the child and family services legislation, the end result of our action should be to help our children develop optimally, thereby to become the best possible parents for their own children. This can break a repetitive pattern which we have all seen frequently, whereby the children of a disadvantaged family are never afforded the optimal health or educational opportunities and, therefore, are left in a situation where they must raise their own children in the same unacceptable conditions.

In reading the bill and much of the testimony associated with it, I am impressed that while initial emphasis is on the child and the family, much of the subsequent discussion seems to center on the child. Perhaps this interpretation is shallow, as one cannot thrive without the nurturing of the other, and vice versa. I would like to strongly suggest that the heavy emphasis on the preschool child is very artificial, and in many situations may virtually hinder the participation of other equally needy but older children. In our own experience with the Head Start program, EPSDT, and our pediatric health council, we have found that in many families the child first identified in this preschool program leads to others at home equally in need of individual support or assistance, other than that afforded either their family or themselves through their school. The program should include not only after school summer programs suggested, but the same intense evaluation and support that is offered to the child under 6 should be made available to his or her older siblings.

There is no doubt that many of the most flagrant examples of children in need of care come from families less well-to-do than yours or mine. At least they receive the most attention, but I would like to suggest that the competitive, both parents working, somewhat anxiety laden, fatiguing existence of families, who imagine their concerns being other than just financial, may produce equally disabling handicaps for their growing children. The father who is "too busy" may frequently be just as damaging as the father who isn't busy at all. The children of the former may be better dressed, but I wonder if they are automatically destined to make better parents than their less well-to-do peers. Perhaps we must also consider a quality of life.

This raises the whole question of a double standard for health care with the family eagerly sought out by social agencies, enrolled in Head Start, and shepherded from one health care facility to another, coming out far ahead of those who may be just too wealthy to receive the same benefits, and perhaps cannot obtain for their children the same quality of care. Those components of this legislation which do not by their very nature limit participation on the basis of socio-economic status, should be afforded all children or interested families.

With regard to these points that I have mentioned, I would like to suggest that the format which is formerly presented here in terms of strict socio-economic criteria serve as source of information, support or guidance for any children or their parents, even if they don't specifically "qualify." They should be afforded the benefit of at least similar expertise in terms of public education. I think what I am trying to say is that if you took this body of knowledge and expertise and you base it on a child population that is limited by socio-economic criteria, that is fine, but if you take the same expertise and channel it through public education toward older children or families who are interested, it would be much more beneficial. Specifically, this information on the health of the children and their families should be available to all children old enough to be interested before they embark on families of their own. I feel that here is perhaps one of the most productive areas to affect a change in the child's future by helping his parents before he is born.

One of my final areas of concern, with regard to the content of the bill itself, is that it may well find itself somewhat handicapped if its benefits can only be offered to those children whose parents have specifically signed for them. Parental guidance and control in a coordinating council is an excellent idea, as is emphasis on its voluntary nature for those families wishing to participate; but if the entire scope of the program and its educational benefits are to be used liberally, flexibly, and to their full potential, it may well be that information made available to groups would have to be limited to only those whose parents have given their written consent. This seems to set up an artificial and unnecessary obstacle that we have not generally found necessary in the past. These are barriers that, for instance, might prevent the participation of older school age children whose parents did not share their concerns.

I would also wonder whether the proposed legislation might call for something just a little bit more aggressive than "voluntary" participation. Whenever I have been asked to speak to a group of parents, I have always been impressed that those who have asked me to speak are those who least need to hear what I have to say. The people who most need to hear about health care for their children are those whose own understanding or priorities just do not include health care. A program such as you are advocating would do well with the parents who are concerned, because they think enough of their children to afford them the benefits of your program, but if the concept is to be successful, all children in need will have to be identified before the age of 6, perhaps way before. Unless there is some identifying agency, such as the local welfare department or the mother's employer, there are some children who do not stand a chance of being helped. I would like to suggest that there should be a more active provision for "outreach," so that a member of the local organization can actively seek out and offer the available services to a family that might not otherwise request them on their own.

Turning now to our experience with our own pediatric health council, and we are really quite proud of what we have done, I would like to make a few comments on the success of a large coordinated health care program in a very rural area. A child and family services program might well function autonomously in a large urban area, but would never do so in our county. The population is 35,000. It is served by approximately 15 physicians in full-time practice, and for years has offered its children free physical examinations and immunizations through local community sponsored clinics managed by the public health nurses. Over the last few years, as our concept of adequate screening services for our children became more complicated, and EPSDT made it more or less mandatory, we undertook a program to offer our children the best care available anywhere.

By preserving the original format for small individual community sponsored clinics, we obviated the need for long distance transportation to larger central facilities, and at the same time essentially eliminated the need for a really complex outreach system because everybody knows everybody else. We formed a parent organization encompassing the local nursing agencies, the mental health facilities, welfare services, educational components, and others. Our project has been supported by the local physicians, who now assist with the supervision of the clinics and manned with the assistance of the Department of Pediatrics of the University of Vermont College of Medicine. This has produced a very effective format for the identification of children in need, their evaluation, and referral for definitive diagnosis and treatment, as well as provisions to enable families in need to avail themselves of health care from the existing system throughout the country.

In our own way, we like to feel that we have already begun to do what you have proposed in your Child and Family Services Act. To be sure, we have a very long way to go.

Several of the points we have adhered to very carefully, and that we feel are extremely important in rural areas where the children are equally needy, and where the doctors may be just as hard to find, with social agencies equally short of funds, are that we have always emphasized that we serve primarily as a source of "organization" for the family in need of help referring them onto local facilities for assistance, and then helping them to get there as well as assuring that they have gone. We have never tried to interupt the relationship between the family and their current source of health care, but rather to reinforce it by helping them to use it more efficiently. Perhaps our small numbers make our program significantly easier to administer, but we feel that our basic success has been derived from our attempts to carefully complement, and perhaps coordinate existing resources, thereby utilizing them more efficiently and preventing any unnecessary duplication. Were we to have attempted all that we have done without regard to the existing health care system in general, we would never have been able to accomplish even a small fraction of what we have done to date.

We look forward to the successful passage of this legislation so that we can have a piece of the pie.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Doctors. Knowing how busy you are in all of your other commitments, the committee is especially grateful to you both for taking the time to come over here and advise with us in our efforts to write a bill that can be successfully passed and signed by the President, and then be effective in helping children of this country. We thank you very much. The next witnesses before the subcommittee today will be a panel of home economists. Mr. Armin Grams and Ms. Gladys Jameson, if you are here. You are both from the University of Vermont. We welcome you here and invite you to proceed in whichever way you prefer.

Panel of Home Economists From the University of Vermont

STATEMENT OF ARMIN GRAMS, PROFESSOR OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. My names is Armin Grams and I am professor of human development and head of the early childhood and human development program in the School of Home Economics at the University of Vermont. Because of the remarks you made earlier, Senator Stafford, about perhaps presenting this in terms of a summary, I have chosen to delete certain portions of the prepared text, which you and your staff have before you, so it will be a little confusing if you try to follow. I intend to read sections of it, but to delete other material. What I intend to delete primarily is illustrative material that I think will not take away too much from the general presentation that I have in mind here today, but, mercifully, it will save us a litle bit of time.

As a professional concerned for almost 30 years with the well-being of children and famiiles and more specifically for the past 18 years with parent-child relationships, child rearing practices, and parent education, I know the need that exists for comprehensive developmental child and family services. For many years I have actively supported legislation such as this, and still do. As a member of one of the forums of the 1970 White House Conference on Children, I participated in the deliberations of the Conference which ultimately produced and sent on to the President of the United States a report that contained a most fervent and eloquent appeal for comprehensive and developmental programs for children and families.

Were such a conference to be convened today, I am confident, Senator Stafford, that we would again resolve overwhelmingly to support programs that the legislation we are concerned with in this testimony will enable the communities of this Nation to initiate, maintain, and extend.

Before addressing myself to a number of items that deal with the implementation, let me make just a few general observations about the act before us. My first comment focuses on the language the bill employs when it discusses parents and family. There are numerous family forums today, and this bill is worded to allow for a distinction between parenthood and parenting. It recognizes that children are cared for and loved in a variety of settings and by a variety of persons. In asserting that any person who has primary day-to-day responsibility for any child is a parent, the bill defines parenting and enables us to hope that the assistance that can be rendered by it will reach those who deserve it most. This is a very commendable feature of S. 626.

Another observation deals with a potential problem. On page 27, lines 3 through 10, section 106 (b)(10), we find a strongly worded charge to employ "insofar as possible" unemployed or low-income persons residing in communities served. Today, of course, there are a number of persons well trained and otherwise qualified to work with young children who are unemployed and consequently low-incomed. The provision in the bill, however, is more likely aimed at encouraging, or perhaps even mandating the use of untrained or minimally trained persons in programs with young children. While I personally heartily endorse the concept of career development because I have seen it work here in Vermont and elsewhere, I urge an interpretation of that paragraph which accepts the view that not everyone can work successfully with young children.

Good intentions are not enough. They must be combined with the right disposition, for example, it helps a lot just to enjoy children, and good training. The bill provides for such training, but it is incumbent upon those who implement it to avoid the harm that can sometimes be done to children by overzealous application of a principle that in general is praiseworthy, but in the specific is potentially dangerous to children. This is a matter of getting our priorities straight. The intent of the legislation before us is first to provide comprehensive developmental care for children and only secondarily to alleviate the problem of unemployment in this Nation. That the two may in some instances be related, we all recognize, but if optimal programs for children are the goals, then we must take care to put first things first.

Let us turn now, Senator, to a consideration of how some of the programs envisioned in the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 should be implemented in Vermont, and this was the principal charge of your letter to us if you remember. We all know that while distances here in Vermont may not be all that great in terms of miles, many families are isolated and consequently are lonely. Many of these families include very young children and their mothers who are literally sentenced to each other. The major portion of the care of preschool aged children takes place in their own homes or in someone else's in the community. Although we have some good early childhood center programs and could use more, the provisions of the bill that should especially be implemented in Vermont are those dealing with care for children in their own homes and in group homes. With funds made available by this act we can develop a network of service to the thousands of homes in this State where children and their parents are living in relative isolation, lacking among other things the stimulation of close friends and neighbors, the hope that could dispel discouragement, and the coping skills that might restore a lost sense of competence and control.

Over the past 15 years research dealing with intervention has led with increasing clarity to the conclusion that parents are by far the most important teachers and shapers their children will ever have and that professionals can accomplish the most on behalf of young children if they make parents their ally. Helping parents to deal more effectively with the developmental process, and to provide the fundamental nurturance their child requires, whether physical, emotional, social, or psychological, is a most efficient means of affecting the course of their children's development. Some experimental intervention programs mistakenly bypassed the parents and concentrated on working directly with their children. Although in the short run some encouraging changes occurred, in the long run they failed because they established discontinuity between the life experience of the child and his parents.

I have long advocated parent education and I heartily endorse the emphasis that the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 places upon "family services, including in-home and in-school services, and education and consultation for parents." There have been times, however, when I despaired of ever being able to reach many parents in a manner and at a time that could have resulted in the greatest benefit to them and their children. I remember hearing something like this said earlier in these hearings today. I remember clearly the frustration I felt after completing a pilot project in parent education in Detroit in the early 1960's.

We knew, as we reported to the 1964 national convention of the American Home Economics Association and later published in the Journal of Extension Education that our model was essentially correct and effective; but there seemed to be no mechanism available to establish such parent education programs in significant numbers around the country to substantially assault the cycle of poverty and failure in which so many of our fellow citizens were caught. The essential thrust of our program was to assist young parents to deal with their preschool children in such a way that the children's chances of having successful experiences in kindergarten and the primary grades might be improved. We believe that any effort directed to enriching the life of a child that did not involve the parents was counterproductive because it fostered measures of discrepancy between the experience of the parents and the children. We had found that many of the parents were themselves eager for enriching experiences, and that when they had absorbed and assimilated such opportunities and in a sense "secured their gains" they willingly, even eagerly, shared these with their children.

Actually this model lends itself remarkably well to a rural community. Because a large element in such programs is a one-on-one teaching situation where individual parents are given new enriching experiences, new coping skills, and new understandings of the delicate interrelationships that characterize a whole child's world, it has natural appeal to the sense of independence that still pervades such homes and communities. A program that aims at helping parents to help their children supports such parents in their attempt to behave in a role-appropriate way and it builds their sense of personal worth and self-esteem. If the public schools will coordinate their efforts with such early childhood programs, they will find that the new alliance has remarkable spinoff in the school experience of the child.

We know from some of the community school programs, however, that this can be done. There are numerous examples where schools have become community centers enjoyed by citizens of all ages because they provide a wide variety of services and opportunities for personal growth and enrichment. When the school and the home become such allies, good things can really begin to happen for children.

But there is yet another provision in the bill that we can capitalize on in rural America. I cannot help but be struck by the coincidence of being asked to give testimony with regard to a bill that provides for mobile units just after submitting a proposal to another funding agency for support of a mobile educational and technical assistance laboratory. Such a facility was one of the highest priority items recommended by a regional advisory committee on child care. It was made because the committee recognized the isolated nature of much of the care provided to young children in this State and the consequent unavailability of such care givers for usual in-service training or regular supplementary training programs. Literally, it appears that if we are to provide assistance to those who care for children in their own homes, we will have to take such assistance to their doorstep.

Mobile units, of course, are nothing new. The health professions have used them successfully for years. The State of Maine has a mobile program of training for persons who care for children in day care homes. Mobile classrooms devoted to a variety of topics have been employed over the years. Most recently we have "The Freedom Train" successfully bringing a bit of Americana to the people of this land, and it is safe to suggest that the majority of individuals who will visit the train might never have traveled to see the exhibits in their permanent locations.

We believe that a properly equipped mobile unit could provide a variety of stimulating educational experiences for parents and other care givers who hardly get out from under the heavy demands that child rearing in isolated rural settings makes upon their time and energy. Such a unit could serve to relieve the parents for some adult experiences that many of them crave and in the long run would make more effective their relationships with their children. The variety of needs that could be met is almost unlimited, but they come readily to mind when one focuses on conditions that frequently limit a parent's mobility, such as the presence of handicapped children and the presence of very young children in the home.

School based programs of parent and preparent education are also important aspects of the bill that have immediate applicability to a rural State like Vermont. Were schools, especially high schools, to incorporate child care programs into the curriculum, a number of interesting corollaries might surface. In the first place, dealing directly with 3- and 4-year-olds and sharing even briefly some of the responsibility for their care is a sobering experience for many young people. Followed by discussions of the pros and cons of child bearing and child rearing, such experiences might enable potential parents to make a reasonable choice rather than a "fadish" one.

Because pregnant students are increasingly encouraged to remain in school, a meaningful and timely program of expectant parent education can be a part of the curriculum. The benefits to their peers who are not pregnant is also clearly a factor to be considered.

Finally, I would stress the importance for Vermont of the bill's provision of funds for research. We know pitifully little about the quality of both real-parent as well as supplemental child care in Vermont. I have in my file a proposal that I submitted 2 years ago for Hatch Act Experiment Station research funds entitled "A Study of Supplementary Child Care in Rural Communities." Due to a sharp limitation of all research support these days, the proposal could not be funded. Some years before that I designed a study of the developmental status of young rural children, and that proposal met a similar fate. We need desperately to reaffirm our belief in sound social science research, and I am pleased that the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 recognizes this need and makes substantial provision for meeting it.

I thank you, Senator, for the invitation to submit this testimony.

Senator STAFFORD. We thank you very much, Professor, for coming over and helping us in our work in this important piece of legislation. We invite Ms. Jameson to proceed.

STATEMENT OF MS. GLADYS B. JAMESON, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, EARLY CHILDHOOD AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Ms. JAMESON. Senator Stafford, and members of the staff, I am Dee Dee Jameson. I am down as Gladys Jameson, but that is my grown-up name. I teach in the early childhood and human development program at the University of Vermont with Armin. In my role at the university, I am primarily involved with the training of young people who want to work with children and their families in the helping professions. In the university's outreach work, I became involved with professionals and paraprofessionals who are at work in Vermont.

Because you ask that we address our testimony to how the Child and Family Services Act would be implemented in a State like Vermont, I think it might be helpful for you to know that I have been a resident of Vermont for almost 30 years and was graduated from the

University of Vermont in 1949, and I live in a small rural community in Vermont.

Prior to my appointment to the faculty of UVM in 1968, I served Vermont as a public school teacher, also as administrator and supervisor of Chittenden East Head Start the first summer of the program's operation, as an instructor in adult basic education, as the founder and teacher-director of the Saxon Hill School in Jericho, as a staff member of the COPA program at Ripton during the first year of the New York-Vermont project, and for 3 years as president of the Vermont Association for Childhood Education. I feel these experiences have made me very aware of the needs and potentials of Vermont and Vermonters.

I, also, would like to begin by commending the writers of the bill on the definition of the term "parent." I feel that this provides us with a more flexible, more functional, and a more humane perception of just what a family is all about.

My testimony will focus on the needs of children and families for programs before and after school and during the summer, and on efforts to extend all service gains into kindergarten and the early years of school.

First, I would like to take a look at what some of those needs are. I realize that these have been gone through and through again, but I think when you are taking testimony the more this gets documented the more you have got proof.

By the time a child is ready to enter school, he is becoming less concerned with himself and more concerned with others. He is interested in doing things—in accomplishing, and he finds satisfaction in learning new knowledges and skills. He feels rewarded by cooperating on projects with other children his age. He needs to prove himself in a group of peers.

In urban or suburban communities, children are able to form spontaneous peer groups. The childhood experiences which are important for social growth and development such as "secret clubs," after supper games of kick-the-can, spending the night at a friend's house, ball games happen more easily when children can walk to the playground, meet in the neighborhood, or walk to each others' homes or apartments. In rural areas, children are isolated from one another, except for the time they spend in school; and much of that time is structured toward cognitive growth and development, which is often at the expense of social growth.

Just as rural children are isolated from one another, so are rural adults. Those who are employed outside the homes do have the advantage of some time with other people. But they have the burden of long hours of commuting time and of worrying about the welfare of their children when school is not in session. As an illustration, I am reminded of some fine people in the Starksboro-Monkton area that I worked with some years ago. They had to leave their homes before dawn in order to pick up their riders and be to work on time in Middlebury, and then during the long winter months they arrived back home well after dark. Parents of children that I have taught frequently have had to make arrangements with me to drop their children off at school early so that they could get to work on time. Even when I arrived at school as early as 7:45 a.m. for bus duty, I regularly found a child whose parents needed to drop him off early huddled in the doorway of the school in an attempt to keep warm.

We can argue as to whether or not his mother should have been working. But the argument, in most cases, is really fruitless. She was working. She had needs—the child had needs—the family had needs. In Vermont these needs are made more critical by factors of geographic isolation and intemperate weather conditions. And, when families are poor, their psychological and physical resources, as well as their financial resources, are truly impoverished. Certainly, it is the mark of a humane and caring society to provide the support services that these children and their families need.

Second, I would like to take a look at how we might best meet these needs in rural Vermont. We would suggest to you that significant progress is possible if we can begin to conceptualize our existing public education system as the basis for a caring community providing a network of support services for children and their families.

Now, in the interest of saving some time, I am not going to read these quotes. I have cited some statistics, and we can find them in many places that show that we are having at least a stabilizing, if not a declining, school enrollment, so that within the foreseeable future we can find it possible in some areas to have classroom space freed up.

The idea of using our existing education system as a community center is not a new thing with this testimony. Right here in Vermont, for example, the village of Essex Junction named its new secondary facility "The Essex Junction Educational Center" rather than using the term high school. This reflects a society which is beginning to view its responsibilities and potentials in a new way.

Vermont is organized into some 55 supervisory school unions or districts. By using the union or district as a prime sponsor, we could utilize the existing system and avoid adding another layer of bureaucracy. Space, equipment, and buses, instead of lying around unused so much of the time, could see more efficient service; and the time and talent of some school personnel more effectively utilized.

Because this would increase the numbers of hours in a day, days in a week, and weeks in a year that the existing system could be used, additional professional, paraprofessional, and maintenance staff would be needed in order to implement before and after school care and summer programs. In no way should the addition of these programs further tax the time and energies of those persons already employed by the education system.

Perhaps the greatest potential for a real community school program lies in the bill's explicit requirement that each prime sponsor shall establish and maintain a child and family service council. The composition and responsibilities of that council, as detailed in section 105, suggest exciting possibilities for making some significant changes in the quality and the direction of public education in our State.

Increasingly, I am hearing that the gains children make in our private and public early childhood programs are wiped out anywhere between the middle of the first and the third year of public school. If this is true, and the assertion originates with public school officials, then I am very disturbed. We must ask ourselves why?

I believe that a part of that answer lies in the fact that as we move from preschool to grade school the focus often switches sharply from child development to education. We have all met situations where our needs as human beings were subordinated to those of the very institutions designed to meet them. Hospitals, schools, and other agencies are often operated more for the convenience of those operating them than to meet the human needs of their clients.

Those of us in early childhood development, especially with a home economics orientation, are very aware of and sensitive to the fact that we are going to be effective in increasing the quality of human development only to the degree that we concern ourselves with all of the dimensions of human life. A child is not simply a cognitive being who enters our school each day to learn—separate from his family. He is his family—and he brings with him that family, its needs, values and ideas. Our challenge lies in developing the kinds of communication and respect necessary to help the child and his family learn how to meet their needs—and to express their wishes—and to develop themselves.

I view the inclusion of the Child and Family Service Council with its membership of parents of the disadvantaged, handicapped, rural, or minority child as one of the most exciting break-throughs possible. The fact that "at least one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child and family services" is to serve on this council enriches its potential. Certainly, the road will not be smooth as union and district administrators and school directors begin to work with a council such as this. But, then, many of us in human development are used to climbing mountains and crossing turbulent rivers as, I am sure, most of you in this room are. How does the saying go? "Getting there is half the fun."

There are two other points I would like to touch on briefly before I conclude. We very much need to provide the option of preschool experiences for all of Vermont's children. Another reason that early childhood gains are wiped out is that the overworked public school teacher is asked to deal with too many children, each coming to school with very divergent backgrounds in group and preschool experiences. For example, one of our recent graduates was hired as a first year teacher in a Vermont public school kindergarten. Every day she relates to fifty children. Some have had very rich backgrounds in terms of stimulation in the home and preschool experiences. Other children have lived in a rather stimulus-impoverished environment until now. How can she possibly challenge the former and nurture the latter, and have everyone move ahead at the same pace? The answer, of course, is that she can't, and gains are wiped out.

Senate bill S. 626 specifically states that child and family services are "to assist parents who request such services." Our experience in Vermont suggest that they will indeed request them, for you will find that whenever a community has incorporated kindergarten into its system of public education, even though it is not mandatory for each child, there is an almost 100 percent enrollment of the eligible children. I am convinced that the Child and Family Services Council could be instrumental in helping us institute preschool programs for all children in our schools.

My second, and last, point is that the education—and I use the term in its broad, development context—the education of our children is big business and is inextricably tied to our economy. Our economy is a part of the fabric of our entire society and culture. When we pull a threat here, or add a stitch there, we change the design, sometimes in small ways and sometimes in ways we had not anticipated, but there is a dynamic of change involved. As we are trying to shift on ecological grounds to a culture which produces less goods and more services, we must be aware of the possibilities open to us as well as to the implications of our decisions.

Those of us involved in the professional training of teachers have long realized that this label—"teachers"—may soon join the ranks of obsolete words. Then, I have a quote in here that talks about a new kind of community facilitator role for the teacher.

We must address ourselves to the task of funding programs developed and staffed to meet the needs of a society which is making some major changes in its design. I feel that this bill is a positive move in the direction of the necessary planning we must do.

A couple of times this afternoon there has been mention made of good luck and the failure of bills such as this to pass; and, so, I have chosen to close on a personal note, if I may. I live what is termed an alternate lifestyle. I am a single parent of five children. I can tell you how it is to reach out constantly for physical and emotional support because you realize that there is no way, no way that you and those children are going to make it alone. I have been more fortunate than many women in my position in that I have an abundance of personal resources in a close community of colleagues and friends, some skills that led me to a good job and its accompanying financial security, and a wonderful group of teachers and adult leaders who helped me raise my children.

But not all families are as fortunate. They need help—real help—the kind of help that this bill can provide. If the Members of Congress and the President of the United States don't know this, then I suggest that they should make it their business to be informed at the grass roots level as to where our priorities must lie. As busy as we are here in Vermont trying to hold our corner of the world together, we'd be willing to take a few national leaders in a bus to see a rural Vermont that you're not going to find on travel posters or picture post cards!

I want to thank you very much for inviting me to make a statement, and I hope what I have said has been of some help. I, again, wish you good luck on the passage of the bill.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for a very moving statement, and a very helpful one. We appreciate the good wishes, which we probably will need. We thank you both very much for joining us. The next panel scheduled to appear with us this afternoon is the Vermont Community Mental Health Panel, and we invite you to come to the witness table. Ms. Meredith Teare, Ms. Marrion Waite, Mr. Roger Strauss, Mr. Edward Hartman, we welcome you, and, as with the other panels, we invite you to proceed in whichever order of precedence you prefer.

Vermont Community Mental Health Panel

STATEMENT OF MISS MARRION E. WAITE, DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH, NEW ENGLAND TASK FORCE ON MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

Miss WAITE. Just as a matter of identification, I am testifying, I believe, partly for the Department of Mental Health, partly for the New England Task Force on Mental Health Services for Children, and partly as a newly retired person who is sort of a freewheeling advocate at this point. Furthermore, for the record, I would like to have you note that in spite of the fact that the letter from the committee came to Mr. Marrion Waite, I——

Senator STAFFORD. The Chair will take additional notice.

Miss WAITE. Thank you. I just had the experience of sitting here and ticking off on my paper most of the points I have made which have already been made in more eloquent language than I could, so I will try to be brief. I will depart a bit from the text, but I would like to make a few points. And I, like the others, commend the full concept of the Child and Family Services Act. It addresses itself to two fundamental issues:

1. It seeks to provide a variety of quality child and family services. Children's services have long been not only fragmented, but delivered in isolation to, or at least with minimal, participation on the part of the family. Parents have become hostile to and alienated often by the very agencies which should be a resource to them.

2. It designates as the target population children aged 15 and under, with highest priority of those 5 and under. Until there is greater attention to early childhood services with an emphasis on prevention, early detection and treatment, the major portion of human service effort and funding will continue to be directed into residual programs. These are the most costly programs consisting of efforts to prevent recurrence of breakdown or to confine or reduce its destructive effects. Much of what we mistakenly call prevention has been second and third line defense.

The purpose of the act, as stated in section 2(b), is undebatable. The priorities are very clear and long overdue, especially the direct participation of parents in the conduct, direction and evaluation of programs; and the partnership of parents with voluntary and public organizations.

The needs of rural families and children are probably more similar to than different from the general population. The unique needs of rural families, including Vermont, arise from distance and the lack of a public transportation system which could put them in touch with services. Social isolation is also a characteristic, but I have found that can exist also in urban areas. Vermont's population is more homogenous than many urban areas with facilities setting up a service which can be pertinent. The extent of need may be indicated, to some extent, by an estimate of a staff member of the Department of Education that there are approximately 48,000 children of pre-first-grade age; that is, 6 and under. This represents about 10 percent of the State's population. As of September 1974, according to the Office of Child Development, there were accommodations for about 7,000 children in licensed day care facilities with a projection for 1980 of spaces for 9,000 to 10,000 children; so there is quite a gap.

The implementation of this act will be crucial. Many questions will arise. Some would disagree with building on the Head Start experience; some would disagree with the designation of the prime sponsor, no matter who it is. But there should be no disagreement as to the need for closer coordination among the many agencies, organizations, and interests.

It is hoped that this act will not contribute to the proliferation of agencies, but that the intent of coordination will become a reality through the utilization of already existing delivery models. The language of the act stresses the term "coordination," and my imagination sort of got ahead of me. I wondered, could this even be a springboard for integration? Or, could it be a springboard to the development of a national commitment to a policy for children parallel to the commitment to the space program, and with comparable funding?

Agencies seem to have been nonresponsive to past efforts on the part of both Federal and State bodies to effect coordination. Established agencies are usually in favor of it if they are doing the coordinating and loudly opposed to it if they are to be coordinated. Parenthetically, this expression comes to me that: "Everybody wants to go to heaven but nobody wants to die!" Real coordination comes about only if personalities want it and if there is a genuine commitment to meeting needs rather than to perpetuating bureaucratic status quo. Collaborative efforts by professionals and interest groups and consumers should replace traditional competitive behavior in the interests of early childhood services. Recently a friend of mine, Norman Lourie, commissioner of welfare from Pennsylvania, described it so graphically—far better than I could. He described the horizontal and vertical coordination and integration among agencies are mostly myth. "Agencies court and dance in planning ballrooms. Sometimes they even have furtive, illicit, usually tentative, relationships, but they seldom marry. Fragmentation—duplication—competition are more usual than fulsome cooperation."

It appears that S. 626 will provide many of the resources long needed by day care programs. The provision of funds for renovation to meet standards, for example. The current rate of pay for day care centers is said to be about 85 cents per hour per child. This really doesn't encourage operators to make substantial investment in order to meet standards. The act also recognizes the need for transportation by making provision for the acquisition of mobile facilities.

There is no disagreement with the intent to give high priority to children from economically disadvantaged families. It is acknowledged that children growing up in poverty pose a higher risk of developmental deprivation—nutritionally, cognitively, emotionally, and physically. This act assures these services without charge to the disadvantaged, but there should be recognition that many families of low to moderate means cannot afford the expense of licensed day care facilities. Many families have a need for day care for reasons other than employment. In these times of high unemployment—10.8 percent in Vermont—this is especially pertinent. Day care has a therapeutic function as well as the function of providing a service which permits employment. It should be available to the parent who is ill or handicapped to the parent wearied by the strain of caring for a sick or disabled or handicapped child or other family member, and who needs some relief from such constant stress.

The sponsors of the act recognize the need for interaction with other socioeconomic levels in section 106(a)(6) which provides "to the extent feasible the program shall include children from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds." Yet it is stipulated that not less than 65 percent of the funds be reserved for the purpose of serving economically disadvantaged children. The concept of day care as a welfare program would thus seem to be perpetuated, yet there are many nonwelfare families who could not benefit from child and family services but are reluctant to do so because of the welfare identity. There is no disagreement with the priority, only that charges must be realistic for other groups if the program is to achieve its optimum potential of meshing backgrounds.

In conclusion, it appears that this act has a real potential for bringing together some of the services already involved in child and family services. It involves social, health, mental health, and educational resources. It can be a force to build the linkages that are needed between health and social agencies on the one hand with education on the other. There must be a unified effort to deliver the needed services rather than to bicker as to which agency is to deliver it. The latter approach is counterproductive and perpetuates only the self preservation of one's territorality at the cost of children.

Thank you.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much. We appreciate it very much indeed, and we would invite the next member of the panel to go ahead.

STATEMENT OF MS. MEREDITH LEAVITT TEARE, EARLY CHILDHOOD CONSULTANT, RUTLAND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE, RUTLAND, VT.

Ms. **Teare**. Hi. You've already seen me on the slide show as a mother. When I arrived today I was sorry to see the agenda and its priorities, but now I'm pleased that the power structure spoke first and those who do the work second.

I submit this testimony to the Senate Subcommittee of Children and Youth regarding the Child and Family Services Act of 1975, S. 626. I represent the Rutland Mental Health Services, Inc., of Rutland County, Vt. As Rutland Mental Health Service's early childhood consultant and a lifelong resident of Vermont, I am in touch with hundreds of families with preschool children in the large and populated county. I enclose a demographic profile of the county. Not only do I consult for Head Start centers, private nursery schools and day care centers, but I am also a regular member of the team working within three well-child clinics scattered throughout the county. I am also the supervisor of the staff of the Rutland Mental Health Service's preschool program for developmentally delayed children, and I have formerly taught in South Boston, Mass., and Bennington, Vt., in such preschool programs. I am also the mother of a 4-year-old child who has been the recipient of child care services since her infancy, and as such a parent I am a staunch supporter of the day care system.

Since 1971 I have consulted with and at one time been on the Policy Council of the Rutland County Head Start program. It is essential that I address the problem of service to the pre-mandatory-school-age population from the historic Head Start perspective in Rutland County, as I feel it addresses the issue at hand in most graphic terms.

First, let us remember that in Vermont: (1) There is no mandatory kindergarten; (2) mandatory school age is 6 or 7—nobody seems to know which—not 5 as in some States. Therefore, many children who are bussed from rural districts to public first grade may have a large number of strikes against them. They are secluded, isolated, very rural, have little or no contact with other children, no available social setting, and attend first grades in towns where children do have a variety of possible social settings, possible nursery schools and kindergartens available to them.

I have reason to visit many homes in those areas and am continually struck by the immense need for socialization these children have prior to exposure in a formal first-grade classroom.

Through 1970–71, eligible children in many of these areas had available to them Head Start programs. In 1972, all rural Head Starts were closed in Rutland County due to: (1) Lack of licensable facilities available to the program, and (2) lack of money for transportation for needed family services. At the present time, all Head Start facilities in Rutland County serve only urban children.

Head Start and the Head Start model serves primarily the urban population. If we have to consider a model viable within the rural setting, and available on an all-day or part-time basis within the Rutland County area, it would be impossible without a large transportation network. Also needed are funding for outreach programing, and decentralized backyard centers, utilizing and training paraprofessionals in the locale and funding to create licensable facilities out of private homes, grange halls, and the like. The latter moneys have not heretofore been available and have created an immense problem for both private and public programs. Our rural Vermont communities do not have apartment building with available first-floor space, storefronts, and modern lowrise buildings. Available space is largely old homes, churches, and grange halls which are not able to meet modern standards of heating, ventilation, health codes, et cetera. This money is a necessity.

If each rural town were to receive funding for such a program, rather than having it centralized, specialty teams would have to be trained. For instance, a backyard center in the town of Hubbardton could serve the children in that area; a trained and supervised mother could provide an emotional and educational setting with appropriate nutritional and health services. Even with this small-scale model, it is to be remembered that transportation would present a problem which can be solved only by providing money for appropriate vehicles meeting safety regulations and mileage for families enrolled in the program. In such a community endeavor, it would seem likely that local parent policy councils and government could work together toward this end.

It is economically unfeasible at this point to send professionals into each home, and money has not been made available to train paraprofessionals. It would seem apparent that we need to continually search for ways to fund such programing.

S. 626 provides us with the opportunity to see that the concept of the family remains intact, that training for outreach services and funding for such outreach become a part of community life. Heretofore the rurally isolated family has continued in isolation, the child entering the mainstream too late to learn socialization skills, the battered becoming the batterer. We do not need to continue this cycle.

I have not addressed such issues as workingwomen in this testimony, leaving it to the committee to read the demographic data attached and leaving it to my worthy friends in the day care system to provide that argument. Let me point out, however, that women do work out of economic or emotional necessity. It is our responsibility to see that appropriate care can be received by their children at appropriately adjusted fees in those settings which appear most comfortable to the individual family.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. It is the intention of the subcommittee to make all of your statements, including the attached data, a part of the record, unless you object.

Ms. TEARE. No; that would be great. There is one correction. The town of Wallingford does have a kindergarten.

Senator STAFFORD. We will note that, since that is the town which the Stafford family came. And we intend to make all of the statements of the panel from the University of Vermont a part of the record, also, unless there is objection to our doing that.

[The information referred to follows:]

Appendix I

Demographic Data (Rutland County)

Age Distrubution:

	1960	1970	Male 70	Female 70
Under 5 years	4,827	4,382	2,185	1,197
5-14	9,122	10,687	5,449	5,238
15-19	3,769	8,941	3,873	5.068
20-34	7,212	5,851	2,877	2,974
35-44	5,822	5,434	2,668	2,766
45-54	5,446	5,828	2,767	3,061
55-64	4,427	5,104	2,453	2,651
65 & over	6,094	6,410	2,465	3,945

Source: Federal Census Figures

Employment/Dependent Distribution:

Available Work Force 1972	22,750
Employed Work Force	21,500
Unemployment rate based on 1972 average	1,250 or 5.5%
Covered employment	15,557

Source: Vermont Department of Employment Security

Dependent Profile:

Dependents:		32,500
Under Age 18	'70 federal census	17,977
Over age 65	'70 federal census	6,410
Other	constructed figure	8,113

Source: '70 Federal Census

Employment Profile

Number of employed men	13,350
Number of employed women	8,150
As a percent total number of women in the region	40.7%
Number of working mothers, with children	
Under 16 years	3,008
Under 6 years	1,119

Source: 1973 Vermont Facts and Figures

Income Distribution All Families-Source 1970 Federal Census

Less than $1,00	247
$1,00-$1,999	358
$2,000-$2,999	629
$3,000-$3,999	684
$4,000-$4,999	650
$5,000-$5,999	971
$6,000-$6,999	1,074
$7,000-$7,999	1,314
$8,000-$8,999	1,063
$9,000-$9,999	902
$10,000-$11,999	1,902
$12,000-$14,999	1,432
$15,000-$24,999	1,227
$25,000-$49,999	268
$50,000 or more	47

Type of Income: Families - Source: 1970 Federal Census	12,768
With wage or salary income	10,880
Mean wage or salary	$ 8,933
Non-Farm self-employment	1,711
Mean non-farm income	$ 6,849
Farm self-employment	530
Mean farm self-employment	$ 3,992
Social Security income	2,994
Mean Social Security	$ 1,647
With Public Assistance or Welfare	540
Mean Public Assistance or Welfare income	$ 1,577
With other income	4,203
Mean other income	$ 1,856
Less than poverty (families)	1,155 or 9%
Mean income for poverty level families	$ 2,060
Poverty level families with children under 18	692

Education - Source: 1970 Federal Census

School enrollment	14,792
Nursery School	71
Kindergarten and Elementary	9,261
High School	3,549
College	1,911

Years of School Completed
(Persons 25 & over)

Years of School Completed
(Persons 25 and over)

Schooling	Males	Females	Total
No schooling	234	233	467
Less than 5 years	316	271	587
5 to 7 years	986	683	1669
8 years	2506	2127	4633
High School 1-3 years	2223	2729	4952
4 years	4447	5664	10111
College 1-3 years	1169	2339	3508
4 years or more	1352	1359	2711

Percent High School graduates 52.7 male and 60.8 female

Households: Source: Vermont Facts and Figures 1973

1970 households in total	15,769
Average size of household	3,16 persons
Persons in group quarters	2,808
Families	12,664
Married couples	10,885
Households with children under 18, husband & wife	6,207
Households with children under 18, male head	134
Households with children under 18, female head	693
Households with family head over 65	2,163

Agriculture - Source: 1973 Report prepared by Vermont Department of Agriculture

Farms (10 cows or more)

1960	632
1965	496
1970	361
1973	307

Absolute change (-328)

"Commercial Dairy Farms"

1970	327
1971	317
1972	279

Absolute 3-year change (-48)

Town	Headstart	Kindergarten Pri./ Pub.	Private nursery school	Day Care Center
Benson				
Brandon		/X	X	X
Castleton		/X		X
Chittendon		/X		
Clarendon		/Title I		
Danby		X/	X	
Fair Haven		/X	X	
Hubbardton				
Ira		X/		
Mendon		/X		
Middletown Springs				
Mount Holly		/X		
Mount Tabor		X/	X	
Pawlet				
Pittsfield				
Pittsford		X/		
Poultney		/X	X	
Proctor		/X	X & Title I	
Rutland City	X	/X	X	X
Rutland Town		/X		
Sherburne		/X	X	
Shrewsbury				
Sudbury				
Tinmouth				
Wallingford		/X	X	
Wells				
West Haven			X	
West Rutland		X/Title I		

Towns	Headstart Centers	Towns with Kindergarten Private/Public	Towns with Private Nursery School	Towns with Day Care Centers
28	1	5/13 (inc. Title I)	9 (inc. Title I)	3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *An Economic Profile*, Rutland Regional Planning Commissions, May 1973

2. Vermont Yearbook, 1974

Senator STAFFORD. We will next either invite Mr. Hartman or Mr. Strauss to proceed.

STATEMENT OF ED HARTMAN, MENTAL HEALTH SCHOOL/HOME COORDINATOR, HOLLAND, VT.

Mr. HARTMAN. I am Ed Hartman. I will be abbreviating my testimony somewhat, so probably it will be kind of difficult to follow.

Senator STAFFORD. We will make your entire statement a part of the record, and you may proceed in any way you wish, Mr. Hartman.

Mr. HARTMAN. Fine. I speak as a representative of the Northeast Kingdom Mental Health Service and a resident of Holland, Vt., which is one of our northernmost towns in the Northeast Kingdom. I think I would like to start my testimony by agreeing with Dr. Holmes and some of our other speakers, that the intent of the bill should go far beyond day care or even preschool considerations to a much more comprehensive plan.

In my work of overseeing mental health programs for elementary schools in the three-county area of the Northeast Kingdom, I, of course, see many problems which may have been averted with adequate preschool screening intervention and education or with proper preventive programs. I'd like to take a hardline proprevention stance, as did Marrion, but I also hope that we will not become entirely incapsulated in programs for ages 0–6 but rather will consider the needs of all children. I will try to testify primarily about mental health as it pertains to this bill but should say that my experiences have led me to come to a definition of mental health for children which encompasses many services from effective prenatal and postnatal care to realistic late adolescent educational and employment counseling. As mental-health workers, we find ourselves seeking, arranging, establishing, or coordinating well-child health services, specialized health services, day care and preschool programs, and alternative classrooms to meet the needs of exceptional children. Good mental health for children also requires teachers and facilities with the resources and training to carry out individualized educational programs to insure the utmost in both cognitive and affective development for students. In addition, we need social and recreational opportunities which become especially germane when we speak of children and their families living in a rural, isolated area.

I perceive, as do my colleagues in my own and other agencies, that effective child and family development demands quality health, social, and educational opportunities for all members of the family in the context of the family. In addition, quality family services depend on competent guidance with a multiagency viewpoint. Mental health for children cannot be separated from the total context of comprehensive child and family services.

I'd like to give you some idea of what it means to be a child in a poor family living in the Northeast Kingdom. For a child in a small town, extraordinary medical services are up to 90 miles away in Burlington. With neighbors often a mile away, social contacts with other than family members may not come until the age of 6 with entrance to the public school system. Many towns do not have kindergarten and special education services are overcrowded and located only in the large population centers. Specialized professional services such as speed and language pathology are limited and have been introduced to the area only in the last few years by the public school system and the community mental health center. A typical school speech therapist is expected to therapeutically serve—that means work with in a treatment capacity and not strictly do diagnosis and evaluation—is expected to therapeutically serve up to 200 children over the course of an academic year.

The smalltown graded schools are seldom able to prepare students for the shock of attending large union high schools. High school students often fail to participate in extracurricular activities due to both an inability to recognize their value and a lack of adequate transportation. Because of the great distances from his home to his school and because of essential tasks to be performed at home before and after school, an active student may be easily discouraged by prospects of a 12- or 14-hour school and workday.

Professional services in the northeast kingdom are extremely limited. While the scope of these services increases, the demands on service delivery personnel far exceeds reasonable limits. For example, the State division of social services has responsibilities for investigating and pursuing cases of child abuse, neglect, and unmanageability. In Orleans and the northern half of Essex Counties a single social worker bears this unwieldly burden. In addition, this worker is expected to sustain an active preventive service caseload for the purpose of avoiding court action in borderline abuse and neglect cases.

The primary problem of our rural families and children, however, is social, economic and cultural deprivation. While all of us in children services recognize the need for specific professional services, we share a strong desire to broaden the horizons of the children and parents we encounter. Only families with a higher social and economic plane are able to take advantage of cultural centers like Burlington and Montreal. Parents and children in the northeast kingdom do not have the opportunity to realize their full potential in the American system.

Ideally, Senate bill S. 626 should provide an opportunity for a community like ours to provide services to families without duplication, but in the context of already existing professional services. However, Senate bill S. 626 remains vague in discussing responsibility for implementation of services. It is my strong belief that responsibility for administration, scope, and description of service under Senate bill S. 626 should lie in the community at the local level. It is repititious; but it is intended to be. The Director of the Office of Child and Family Services should designate as prime sponsors those existing agencies with an already established administrative structure. Too often money designated for child and family services is consumed in administration. I would commend the Senate subcommittee for section 104(6) which assures that "administrative costs of the child and family service councils, local program councils, and project policy committees, will not exceed 5 percent of the total cost of the programs administered by prime sponsors."

A great measure of the success or failure of the intent of Senate bill S. 626 in rural Vermont will be in the selection of a prime sponsor. I see this as the major problem in initial implementation of the bill.

I feel that the prime sponsor should be an existing professional service agency with the already established support and cooperation of all segments of the community. The prime sponsor should be mandated to solicit and maintain the active cooperation of other service agencies in both planning and administration.

Once designated, the prime sponsor should be a repository of information regarding available services. This agency should then assist other service agencies in establishing complementary roles in providing services. Finally, the prime sponsor should develop and provide, either in-house or through other agencies, services defined that are not presently available in the community.

The Office of Child and Family Services, together with the prime sponsor, should monitor their own and other agencies in the delivery system to prevent duplication of services.

Annual evaluation should allow input to the Office of Child and Family Services from community agencies other than the prime sponsor regarding the effectiveness of the program as implemented and administered by the prime sponsor.

I feel obliged in the interest of local control and efficiency to repeat my concern over section 104(d) which will permit a State to apply as a prime sponsor. I would suggest to the committee that our rural Vermont areas pose questions whether a State or any aspect of government is appropriate for that role.

I have further questions about section 103 (a), which delineates the distribution of funds. When first read, this section appears to use the fairest way of dividing up the money, simply splitting it up in proportion to the number of members of a certain population at risk in a given State or local area. However, if we assume that a certain minimal amount of funding is prerequisite to the running of any quality program, allocations based on any per capita percentages are potentially discriminatory against areas of low population density. Potential for change and the level as well as the number of disadvantaged children should be considered with some latitude on the part of the funding source when reviewing each applicant.

To develop somewhat further on the idea of quality implementation of Senate bill S. 626 in a rural area, the importance of title 4 of this bill has to be emphasized. Because of our inability to pay professional wages competitive with urban areas of the country, we are often performing with staff members of less training and experience than would be desirable for the realization of optimal program goals. Also, because we are commonly accustomed to functioning with nonprofessional and paraprofessional staff members in key positions, in-service training is one of our foremost ongoing needs.

Although workers in State and local agencies are definitely the people with the field knowledge and expertise necessary for providing services, they are, in my experience, usually not the most able teachers. I would hope that training grants and contracts would be awarded, at least in part, to institutions of higher learning and private organizations who have developed systematic training plans of some proven worth. Much time has been wasted by human services personnel in attending informal workshops and inservice training sessions which lacked any serious curriculum or solid informational content. We need training in specific practical skills which will help us deliver defined services in an efficient and accountable manner.

In conclusion, there is always some difficulty in going at a cognitive level from the abstractions of Federal legislation to local implementation. In an area such as human development it is also very difficult to delineate the needs of families and children, even when one is speaking about only a very limited geographic area. The answers to these problems certainly do not lie in middle class professionals, agencies, or programs imposed on individuals in a community from the State or Federal level. Successful implementation will include absolute local control and participation and programs which do not impose any particular value hierarchy, but will allow people to grow and develop in the subculture in which they live. The key to the success of Senate bill S. 626 in rural Vermont will not lie in the definition of the program but rather with the people who are implementing it.

What must be selected are sensitive competent prime sponsors at a local level who are aware of the problems and needs of their particular community and who have demonstrated ability to interface with all members of the community including, and perhaps most importantly, the agencies and organizations providing services to people. This bill properly administered could play a large part in helping us in the community to strengthen existing services, and perhaps begin to fill the gaps which are presently existent in our ability to encourage, promote, and sustain a reasonable level of child and family development for the people we are responsible to.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Hartman, for a very well thought out and carefully reasoned paper and your testimony. We are sure it will be of great help to us in our work on this bill. The subcommittee invites Mr. Strauss to proceed.

STATEMENT OF ROGER STRAUSS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. STRAUSS. I am the executive director of one of the community mental health services, the one in Washington County. I will just speak essentially about notes from my experience in this area, and will go a little further afield than my paper instead of reading it.

First of all, I would just like to state that I commend the bill because of its prevention aspects. In a field such as mine I know how much money we spend to treat after the fact; and, as a matter of fact, this is essentially an inefficient way of doing business. It's necessary, but it is inefficient.

Working with children, and/dealing with children, to teach healthy growth development skills is one of the best ways to prevent it. It is the essence of prevention essentially. I think there is also a certain ease in dealing with children, a kind of concept of the fact that the clay hasn't baked. We can mold; we can change personality by changing environments. There is a certain strong motivation on the part of people who work with children and there is a motivation on the part of parents to change as long as they are not threatened, and I think that is very important. Very often professionals, whether they are in education or human services, are always casting blame. And whether directly or indirectly we enter onto a situation with a blame theme, we essentially threaten and turn parents off.

I think therefore that one of the most important aspects of the bill and its content is the education of the parent. I know of no better way and no less threatening way of helping parents to adjust to children and to help them grow than to provide essentially good, stressless education within their own local communities.

I would also say that one of the most important aspects of the bill, which I think needs a certain amount of emphasis, is that services should be provided in the communities where the child and the parent lives. In our business, again, we have for lack of funding, essentially provided the most efficient service delivery. The most efficient service delivery is to plop someone in a center and to have people come to you. In some ways, it turns out to be less efficient because you do not get to the high risk client, and I think in the long run you do not "cure" as quickly nor is the result of the change as stable as when you do go to the centers where the problems exist. I think our experiences in field services in this area are far and away a better way, but, unfortunately, a less efficient one in the short run. Because of that, of course, there is a good deal of transportation problems. And I think this is a very important area of the implementation which perhaps needs to be mandated and worked out a little more in the bill itself.

I think another thing that needs to be worked out in the bill with guidelines spelled out is coordination. This is a comprehensive bill, and I think that coordination is absolutely essential. I think also that we have had enough experience with coordination as a word that it never happens. It's not going to happen unless essentially it is mandated from the bill itself and the evaluation of the prime sponsor. Whether that prime sponsor is at a local or at a State level, the evaluation has in it a strong component that says there must be coordination. You must show that agencies are working together. I don't think that is in the bill. I think if you don't have it there you are going to find that you will have another very good bill, and it will be a very commendable bill, but I don't think it will go far enough along the lines that Marrion was talking about of perhaps integration.

I certainly wish you good luck. I choose to be brief and I think you will find that as merciful as anything. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Neither this chairman or Calvin Coolidge would ever object to brevity. We thank you very much for your testimony, Mr. Strauss, and we appreciate the appearance of the panel. The final witnesses before the afternoon session of the subcommittee today will be Ms. Pat Jewett of Boston, Mass., and those who may be accompanying her and wish to come to the table.

STATEMENT OF MS. PATRICIA A. JEWETT, SWAMPSCOTT, MASS., CHAIRPERSON, PUBLIC POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN

Ms. JEWETT. I have a logistical problem. We thought we were going to be on between 5 and 6 and two of our people are on the road. Miss Gwen Morgan called and said she would not be able to come; but, hopefully, we will make it.

Senator Stafford and staff members, my name is Patricia Jewett. From October 1973 until October 1974, I served as chairperson of the New England Head Start Directors Association and in that role as coordinator of the New England Child Care 1976 Committee. From September 1974 until March 1975, I worked for the Day Care and Child Development Council of America as their New England regional coordinator. Since September 1974, I have also been chairperson of the public policy committee of the New England Association for the Education of Young Children.

Thus, for the past year and a half, I have had the opportunity to travel throughout the six New England States working and dialoging with staff and parents from a wide variety of programs: Head Start, title IV–A funded day care, nursery school, and private kindergarten programs, proprietary day care programs, and staff from State departments of welfare, mental health, offices of child development, and departments of education. It is from this perspective that I am speaking today.

Incidentally, I guess I should say, however, that I spent the 6 years and two summers prior to last September working here in Vermont in Head Start and day care; so I am aware of Vermont's problems, too.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank you for opening this hearing up to some non-Vermonters. Hopefully, some of the others will get here. And I would also like to thank you for what appeared to me to be your continuing and unrelenting efforts to create a commitment in this country to meeting the needs of children and their families.

There are two points which I wish to address today: The question of eligibility for service and the question of who should be allowed to deliver services under this bill.

First, in relation to the question of eligibility, I would like to strongly urge that the committee reexamine the requirement of 65 percent of the children and families served be economically disadvantaged. I believe we do a grave injustice to American families by always assuming that it is those with the lowest income who are in the greatest need of services. Of course, they often do not have the adequate resources to purchase the kind of services which they need. However, the continuous limitations of program eligibility to those with low incomes causes an unfair stigma to fall on these families. It is assumed that it is from these families from which the most abused and neglected children come. That it is these families who are in the greatest need of parenting education. Those who have worked with young children and their families can tell you that this is not true. Moreover, this stigma is compounded by the resentment foisted upon them by families who do not qualify for such services themselves, but whose taxes go to pay for services for the poor; many of whom are not much richer than the families being served.

There is strong feeling that the base of eligibility for such a bill providing services to children and their families must be broadened, both to gain support for the passage of the bill and because there is a great population of families who need supportive services both for themselves and their children. Families who are suffering the pressure of the tremendous economic crisis in America today, who presently make too much money to qualify for services under Head Start or title XX, but who make far too little money to begin to think of paying for these services. We must extend the eligibility of services to these families.

This certainly does not mean that we should abandon our efforts to serve low-income families. However, I do not see where that will happen. There is built-in protection for Head Start programs in this bill and services presently given under title XX will also continue. Since that is the case, I would strongly suggest that to require 65 percent of the families served under this act also be economically disadvantaged is not reasonable. Instead, the percentage should be lowered and realistic sliding fee schedules should be developed to begin to broaden the range of families served.

Second, I would like to make a few comments on who should be allowed to deliver services to young children under this act. This has become one of the more controversial issues surrounding this bill since it was reintroduced last August, as the move to make the public education system the prime sponsor has become increasingly stronger. Early childhood education and day care services in one form or another have been a part of our society since before 1900. And, these services have become much more than simply custodial services for young children whose mothers are working or educational services for children from upper middle-income families. In many cases, they have become a set of comprehensive, support services for the entire family. Moreover, many, and most I would say, of these programs exist because of the dedication and caring of severely underpaid staff who have operated these programs for years without adequate funds. One of the most exciting features of these programs has been the diversity in types of programs offered and the flexibility these programs have demonstrated in utilizing space, hiring staff, and enrolling families that need the services. Many of these people realized that they were not doing all that they should, but they were doing the best that they could under the circumstances. For years these programs have struggled with the hope that one day this country would make a real commitment to serve the needs of children and their families and would thus give them the kind of support, both moral and financial, which they need to do the kind of job they would really like to do.

Now that we are finally on the brink of seeing the possibility of making such a commitment become a reality, we find that there is a cloud which has suddenly appeared on the horizon in the form of the public education system which is saying, "It is our system which is the appropriate one to provide services for young children. You folks in the private sector have not done a very adequate job in the past and now it is time for the public sector to move onto the scene. Moreover, now we have the staff and available space to do the job." For many people who have struggled to do the best they could to provide quality services to young children, who have often seen the public school system ignore their efforts, this is a bitter pill to swallow.

However, I am not here to argue the merits of one agency versus another as the single administering agency or one system versus another as the prime sponsor. Instead, I would like to argue that the legislation written be flexible enough to allow for differences both from State to State and within States. For, if it is one element which has become clear to me as I have traveled around New England, it is the fact that there are vast differences among the States and within States both from program to program and among the States' interest in and the capability of planning and administering programs for young children. In some places Head Start programs are of high quality and are well respected. In other places this is not the case. In some places, title IV-A funded day-care programs are providing excellent services. In others, the programs are not so good. Some public school systems are and have been operating high quality early education programs and have a good working relationship with day care, Head Start, and other early education programs in their areas. In others, the school systems remain aloof and are often uninterested in the early years.

However, there does seem to be general agreement that the majority of public school systems do not yet encompass the comprehensive social service and parent involvement components which have become an integral part of many early childhood education programs in the past years.

From State to State there are vast differences in practice, and in capability in administering funds for programs for day care and other programs for young children. Some States have arbitrary, differential reimbursement rates for private-for-profit centers. Others do not. Some States have Interagency Councils or Offices for Children which have begun to grapple with the problems of coordinating services for children and doing some long range planning in this area. Others are far from this stage. Some States have implemented far-reaching special education laws which include young children and are beginning to provide funds to implement these services. Other States have the laws but have appropriated no moneys. Thus, it has become clear to me that no one State agency or any category of program at the State or local level has proven universally to be the best vehicle to provide services to children and their families. And this diversity geared to meeting local needs and local problems has been the secret of the success that so many day-care and early childhood programs have offered.

Therefore, it would seem to me that the funds in this bill should go to those agencies and programs which are able to provide the best quality of services to children and their families. Programs which already have a proven track record or those which could provide quality services given some extra funds and some good technical assistance. No type of program should automatically be excluded nor should any one type of program or agency automatically be given first priority. Instead, those applying to be prime sponsor or those applying for project funds under the prime sponsors should have to demonstrate their ability and the willingness to provide quality comprehensive services to children and their families, their willingness to include parents and community members in the planning and policymaking for the programs, and their ability to coordinate with and maximize other existing programs and resources in the community.

The great strength of this bill is its emphasis on meeting the needs of children and their families rather than on fulfilling the needs of a given system, whether that be to support welfare mothers going to work or filling empty public school classrooms and employing unemployed teachers. I strongly urge that this remain the central focus of the act and that the funding mechanism remain flexible enough to provide funds first to those agencies or programs in each State and locality which can provide the best quality of services to meet the needs of America's children and their families.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for your testimony. In connection with what you have said about the language in the bill, which is a definition of "economically disadvantaged children," it may be that that language should be reexamined, but it actually is designed so that currently $9,200 of income for a family of four is the cutoff rather than something around $4,000. I thought you might like to know that. We don't want to exclude the possibility of other colleagues of yours from testifying. The subcommittee would be willing to wait a few minutes. Have they traveled from Massachusetts to be here?

Ms. JEWETT. From Concord, N.H. I understand Nina left her office around quarter of 3, so she should be here.

Senator STAFFORD. The subcommittee will stay in session a little longer to give them a chance to get here. Are they staying overnight?

Ms. JEWETT. I don't know; I don't think so.

Senator STAFFORD. Since the subcommittee will stand by for a minute or 2, is there anybody who has not testified today who feels inspired to talk to us for 2 or 3 minutes? If not, the subcommittee will recess for 10 minutes to give the witnesses a chance to get here.

RECESS

Senator STAFFORD. The subcommittee will come to order and resume the hearing on the bill S. 626. We have a very attractive mystery witness here as our last witness of the day, and we will invite you to identify yourself and go ahead.

STATEMENT OF NINA SAZER, STATE COORDINATOR, NEW HAMPSHIRE CHILDREN 1976, CONCORD, N.H.

Ms. SAZER. I was going to address the whole subcommittee, but I will just address you, Senator Stafford. I am Nina Sazer, and I live in Cornish, N.H. Four years ago, I started a day care center in Norwich, Vt., and worked there for several years as director and as a teacher. Since last July, I have been working for the Child Development Council of New Hampshire as State coordinator of New Hampshire Children 1976—a Bicentennial public education project designed to increase public awareness of the needs of children and families in New Hampshire. I am speaking to you today as a former child care provider, as a professional working with a broad spectrum of people with a broad spectrum of attitudes and needs relating to child care, as a representative of the Child Development Council of New Hampshire, and as an individual deeply committed to a government which serves to meet the basic needs of its people. And, I see the availability of quality child care and family support services as a basic need of all people in this country.

I am in total and enthusiastic support of the Comprehensive Child and Family Services Act of 1975. As legislation, it is a positive step toward both Federal responsiveness to human needs and local autonomy in meeting those needs. I sincerely hope that it will be enacted by our Congress.

Because of your demonstrated and consistent commitment to the crucial importance of providing quality services for children and families, and because you are obviously aware of the potential benefit to our nation which would result from the availability of these services, I don't feel it necessary to dwell on those points. I would, however, like to address two areas of the bill in which I would like to see some modification and clarification; the area of who would deliver the services provided for in the bill and the area of eligibility.

Speaking to the delivery of services, the development and growth of child care services in this country has been a relatively recent and uniquely exciting process. Because of newness and a lack of a widespread, long-standing history as an institution, child care has emerged as a real response to peoples' needs without a traditional pattern or design for how that care would be provided. As a result, there has blossomed a rich diversity in child caring programs, a responsiveness to community needs and the opportunity in some places for families to have options in the kinds of care they find for their children.

In addition, because of a lack of a timeworn standard curriculum, early childhood programs have provided many innovations in program content which serve as a real contribution to all programs and institutions serving children and youth; from including a total awareness of a child's classroom needs—academic, emotional, and cultural—to seeing the need for meeting a child's needs in a total way—helping parents learn more about child development, providing health and nutritional services. The list goes on and on.

Clearly, not all child caring programs are good; some are appallingly bad. But the quality of these services has developed independent of other public institutions—public schools, public health, et cetera—and the quality of these services cannot be determined by the physical, financial or corporate structure which houses them.

Therefore, I think it of vital importance that there be a flexibility spelled out in the law which would allow for a diverse delivery system—profit, nonprofit corporations, public schools, et cetera—and would insure that a standard of quality be the determining factor in deciding who delivers services to children and families.

We are, with this legislation, in the position of being able to create a new design for serving the American people. We can create a design which guarantees the American value of diversity. We can create a comprehensive child and family support system which can be protected from the maladies of rigidity, institutionalization, and standardization. This potential presents a unique opportunity and could have enormous historical impact on the direction of how our Government will serve to meet its people's needs.

Speaking to the question of eligibility, because of the rapid changing and complex social and economic conditions in the country today, more and more Americans are encountering a need for a wide range of support services, and fewer and fewer are finding themselves capable of coping with the total costs of their needs.

Traditionally, child care and family support services have been available to low-income families via Government funding programs and to families wealthy enough to pay for the costs independently. The low-middle and middle-income levels have been economically excluded. They earn too much to qualify for Government subsidies and too little to afford the cost of quality services. In addition to being economically excluded from child care services, American middle-income families are providing tax support to a service from which they cannot reap benefits.

This disparity is felt and expressed by many families and citizens I have talked with and worked with over the past years. I have also realized that this disparity is the major factor in a seeming general apathy or lack of constituency regarding child care legislation.

This bill provides that other major funding programs which serve low-income children and families would not be eclipsed. Since title XX and Head Start funding would remain intact, I would strongly urge that instead of the 65 percent of funds being reserved for low-income families and children, which is redundant, that a significantly higher percentage of funds be prioritized for middle-income families on a sliding fee schedule.

In addition to such a change being much more equitable for American families and children, experience in the field has proven that the need for the kinds of services this bill would provide is not only needed by low-income children and families. Held up to the light of current American economic and social conditions, the stereotypic assumption that only low-income members of our society need child care and family support services begins to fade.

Child care needs cut across economic strata and it is time to adjust our legislative priorities to reflect that reality.

I thank you for this opportunity to testify about this bill and for your continued support of American children and families.

Senator STAFFORD. We thank you for coming and helping us in our deliberations on this bill. As we said to your colleague from Massachusetts, Ms. Jewett, the definition in our bill, as it now exists, of an economically deprived child may be somewhat misleading since the definition as it is in the bill works out to a family income of $9,200 for a family of four, which would get into the lower middle income families. We think we should probably clarify that aspect of our bill. At this point I order printed all statements of those who could not attend and other pertinent material submitted for the record.

[The material referred to follows:]

Statement of Joseph S. Handy, Commissioner, Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

Comments on: Child and Family Services Bill - HR2966

The Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services is heavily involved in services to families and children and therefore this bill is of particular interest and importance to the Department. The Department's central office and twelve district offices of the Division of Social Services provide direct services to approximately 2500 children from 1400 families in the Title IV-A day care program. This year more than 1500 complaints of abuse or neglect will be investigated by Department staff and on-going "protective" services will be provided to an average of 500 families and 1500 children. Care and supervision will continue to be provided to those 1300 children in the Commissioner's care and custody while continued services are provided aimed at re-uniting natural families, or, if that is not possible, freeing these children for adoption. The Adoption Unit gave 55 of these youngsters a chance for a secure home during the last year and arranged for a total of 124 adoptions benefiting both children and their new families. Additional services to families and children receiving public assistance, medicaid, general assistance, and food stamps are provided within the constraints of staff availability and resources.

It is in this latter category (resources) that this bill holds promise. There is no doubt that additional resources are necessary to meet the needs of children and families in the "economically disadvantaged" sector of our population and to begin to address the unmet needs of families and children in all sectors of society.

Drafters and sponsors of HR2966 are to be commended for attempting to address this need in a broad, comprehensive, coordinated and relatively non-categorical manner. However, some of the bill's provisions seem to this Department to signal a danger of producing the opposite result from that intended, i.e. further fragmentation rather than coordination, and could act to minimize rather than maximize the potential benefits of new resources.

Specificly, the strong emphasis on lay participation in detailed program administration at both the prime sponsor and local levels may replicate the experience of the Developmental Disability Councils which were established to bring advocacy and over-all coordination to efforts in the Developmental Disabilities field and to review, apprise, and monitor special grant funds. The overwhelming experience of these councils was that the role of grant administrator for a relatively small amount of funds completely overshadowed the broader coordination and advocacy function. Attempts to legislatively change this focus are currently before Congress.

Opportunities for direct funding of local projects, multiple prime sponsorship and no clearly designated line of accountability within the state seem destined to stimulate competition rather than cooperation.

The idea of a new Office of Child and Family Services which will assume responsibilities of the present Office of Child Development and "coordinate all such programs within the Department" may be a positive step, although if such coordination is limited to the establishment of a national Child and Family Services Coordinating Council, this is unlikely to have the kind of impact hoped for.

Requiring the establishment of an Interagency Council on Family and Child Services at the state level with responsibility and accountability for planning use of new resources in consort and coordination with existing programs may be worthy of serious consideration. In fact, the Vermont legislature has moved in that direction through creation of the Interagency Council on Child Development. This Council has had a year's experience and has uncovered existing resources in the area of children's services. With the capability represented in this bill, the council would be in the best position to assume maximum benefits to all of Vermont families and children.

Statement of John Bloch, Director, Orleans County Council of
Social Agencies, Inc., Worcester, Vt.

Good afternoon gentlemen:-

Today I should like to deal with four areas of concern as they relate to S.626:

1. Prime sponsorship
2. Parent control
3. Impact on rural areas
4. Facility construction in rural areas.

By way of background on myself and my experience which I believe allows me to make effective comment on the above; is as follows:

1. Director of Child Development for the Orleans County Council of Social Agencies, Inc., the local Community Services Agency for the Northeast Kingdom
2. State Chairperson for Head Start Director's Association of Vermont
3. Executive Committee of Region I, Head Start Director's Association
4. Board member of National Head Start Director's Association
5. In addition I have worked with rural communities for the past ten years in Vermont, Virginia, and Indiana

Prime Sponsorship - who should have it?

The role of the prime sponsor in term of this legislation is to enter into arrangements to carry out programs under this title. As I see it, it is of critical importance to the quality of services being offered to children and their parents that the entity entrusted with this responsibility be dedicated to quality of service, strong and direct parental control, the "total" development of the child, and the importance of the program's relationship with the local community. Neither the public school system or the state government have a particularly good track record in terms of meeting those objectives.

Returning to the questions of prime sponsorship:-

The Public School System already has a vast and complicated task to accomplish in terms of primary and secondary education; one which in the opinion of many is not being accomplished particularly well.

For example, a recent survey of high school students in Burlinton, Vermont, who were deemed by peers and faculty to be "successful" academically and socially, indicated that given a choice, 25% would like to drop out of school.

In addition, the Children's Defense League recently conducted a nationwide study of public schools in which the league found some two million children, 3/4 of which were between the ages of 7 and 13, had been excluded from public schools because of the schools lack of outreach and flexibility to meet specific problems. Physical handicaps, inability to pay for appropriate clothing, and transportation problems were among the reasons cited for expulsion.

The second major problem with the public school as prime sponsor is that it does not have a strong history of committment to parental involvement in the child's developmental process. The Act mandates that direct responsibility and participation of parents (through parent councils) be present in development and operation of programs, as well as through the establishment of a regular basis of consultation between parents and staff about the child and his development, and that ample opportunity be provided for the parent to observe and participate in the child's activities.

In Vermont, public school policy is made by faculty and school boards (usually composed of three adult members of the schoold district who have been elected by the populace of that district and who do not necessarily have children presently attending that school system). Parent Teacher Association have no control over hiring-firing practices, subject matter to be instructed, operation of schools, etc.

In addition, the traditional public school system does not have nor is it likely to have expertise in the near future in dealing with children within the critical developmental years from 0-5 years. Compatible with facilitation of good development during those years are such attitudes as flexibility and recognition of individual needs and difference. The public school system has traditionally failed in terms of meeting such requirements.

Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, has bullishly asserted that he will rally the clout of AFT, NEA, school boards, and other elements of organized labor behind an insistance of a bill mandating all child care programs be put under the auspices of the public schools. Says Shanker, "the function of education belongs with the public schools............. the worst thing we can do is to splinter available funds".

I should like to take this opportunity to respond to brother Shanker as follows:

1. The bullwork on which this country was founded was diversity and it is precisely because of over centralization and over governmentalization that many of our current ills are rooted.

Take for example, cost of state education and plight of small communities, when union schools were introduced into this state. But far more damaging than cost alone has been the shredding of community which resulted when union schools were put in.

Also coterminous with union schools has been the rise of well organized Superintendents Associations and Teachers Associations and Unions pited against the general public who must pay the bills.

I would suggest that this committee for example look at the Philadelphia School System which operates a Day Care Center where per pupil cost is over $5,000 as compared with non-public school operations of Head Start which average $1,050 or so. Critics of Shanker maintain that meaningful child care services are much more inclusive than traditional "education" and that we need to contend with the whole of the child's development not merely his cognitive development. The Washington Research Project Action Council feels that diverse programs which meet total child development needs can't be done in a rigid delivery necessitated by all delivery of services being vested in one principal agency such as public school. Another criticism of Shanker's position is that he and his organization are looking at the incorporation of early child care services under public school auspices in terms of an expanded labor market, in a period of high unemployment for teachers, rather than as a rational for quality child care services.

B. The State as prime sponsor appears too large, also, and too deeply engrossed in bureaucratic red tape; multi-responsibilities, and lax in terms of built in accountability systems to local communities and parents. In terms of a track record with delivery of child care service, it's record is absymal.

In the summer of 1971 I became involved with the pretest, known as FAP, when I began my current job as Director of Child Development for OCCSA. As I noted then and note now that the state could not and did not perform with anything like effectiveness but did manage to expend over 2 million dollars in the process.

In July of 1970 a model program to pretest Nixon's Family Assistance Program was set up on Vermont of which the child care component surfaced as the most significant part of the program to be tested. The Leadership

Institute for Community Development was commisioned by HEW to do an evaluation in 1972 of the protest Titled (Day Care in Vermont).

The result of the pretest and its accompaning monies from DHEW and OEO was the creation of a morass of confused, disorganized and unresponsive child care centers for low income children which ranged in quality from custodial to just meeting licensing regulations. These centers are recently collapsing due to Vermont's unstable financial status and the cutting of state matching funds.

The problems at the onset of the pretest were many and multi-faceted and the study did not level specific blame but rather indicated that bureaucratic strings from various branches of governments, too hastily and poorly planned implementation of the program, confusion as to goal objectives, etc, were some of the factors contributing to the failure of the pretest. Fundamentally, the state government failed to provide for: local control (although 4-C Committees were created but functioned in actuality as merely a layer of decentralized administration between state government and the day care providers), parental control, and quality day care but instead acted as a licensing bureau for centers providing daily care for low income children with no goal orientation toward total child development.

In terms of delivery of health services to young children the state government appears to be presently dragging its heels. The state government seems hesitant to implement the federally Mandated E.P.S.D.T. program or does not know how. Welfare's cooperation and collaboration with other E.P.S.D.T. Grantees such as Head Start and Home Health Agencies, is all but non-existent.

C. What I do is advocate using local units of government and/or where possible direct funding of Indian tribes, public or private agencies, i.e. Head Start, Community Action, etc. who have demonstrated their ability to develop programs and involve parents.

Furthermore, I should like to point out to this committee that currently this state does not use fully its appropriation for Children under Title 19, soon to be Title 20 of SRS. It (Vermont) uses about 3.2 million of a 5.1 million appropriated.

Part of the reason for it is lack of ability and committment to children by this state might lie in its system of priorities; for we (Vermont) spend approximately $8,000 per mile for Interstate maintenance per year out of state funds but nothing approaching that committment is spent for children's services.

I therefore implore you to rethink making states prime sponsors when looking at what this state has done over the past years; and I might note on the positive side, that this state is one of the more forward looking ones when it comes to the concern of children. What I am saying is that I feel that states are inappropriate organizational settings for the delivery of S.626 and do not have the ability to pull it off -- not to mention the 5% rake-off provided for in the bill for state administration.

When looking at our Office of Child Development here in Vermont, questions such as: Who is qualified to develop 0-5 programs? Who has operational experience and what are the state's committments to this office from state funds? arise. What they (OCD) do best is push panic bars on doors and flush toilets along with mountains of paper.

It seems sensible to assume that some degree of local control is required if the needs of the community at large are also to be met.

Both state government and Public School Systems have become too entangled in the bureaucratic muddle to decentralize, to be flexible, or responsible to change within the community and to individual needs. The only way to insure that emphasis on the parental and local control on these programs at large is to award prime sponsorship to an agency or organization as closely related to the people to be served as is possible to do while insuring quality and reliability of service. That would be small units of local government, public or private agencies such as Head Start, Community Service Programs, Indian Tribes, etc. Head Start has good track records with programs with disadvantaged people (this Act appropriates 65% of available funds to this category), an established reputation for emphasis on the child's early developmental years as well as on parental control (as prime motivator of the child), a tradition of ability to adapt programs to local and cultural conditions, and an emphasis on employment of local paraprofessionals and low income persons.

2. Importance of Parent Control

The importance of Parent influence on and involvement in child development programs is paramount. For one if not the most grievious facets of public school systems and government in general has been the almost universal inability of later to understand what citizen participation is all about and that, like a big muscle, if democracy is not constantly practiced and used, it will atrophy and fall into disuse.

Therefore along with the services which this Act provides for, the training which the parent will derive from the outlined decision making process contained in this bill is of upmost importantance. For sadly, the public schools have failed miserably to carry out Thomas Jefferson's mandate and rational for public education being financed from public funds; namely, that of equipping the population, who attend these public schools, with the ability to maintain and operate a democracy of enlighted voters. We must rededicate ourselves to this proposition as we get ready to celebrate out 200th birthday -- and I can think of no better way to do that than provide for a mechanism of governance in S.626 that mandates parental control and protects that mandate from encrouchment from bureaucrats in the name of efficiency and labor leaders in the name of full employment. ------- This Act makes provision for parental control through its "Child and Family Service Councils" composed half of parents of children being served by the program, but does not indicate mechanisms for further involvement in the daily developmental process that takes place in the child program.

At the core of Head Start philosophy is the recognition of the role of the parent as the prime motivator in the development of the child; a further facilitation of that motivation through education, socialization, and training of the parent - in terms of self image and the developmental process of the child is a basic tenent of the Head Start Demonstration project: Parent-Child Center. Compatible with this philosophy is the dedication of Head Start to the concept of strong parental influence within the child development program in terms of decisions making and operations, participation in classroom and program activities, as well as deference given to parents to organize and participate in activities, meaningful to themselves within the program.

Another reinforcement of the importance of parent control and its impact on the community at large is the need cited in the Act for "career ladders" or training programs for local parents and paraprofessionals. From Head Start experiences, these "ladders" have acted as bridges between the Parent-Child Center relationship and the community at large.

3. Rural Impact and Rural Problems

The major shortcoming, in my opinion, of this Act is the failure of the legislators to incorpate within it any special provisions for rural America. Speaking to the circumstances of Vermont (which is only one of 11 rural states in the Nation), as defined in the 1970 census, she has an estimated and average per capita income of $3,465 which ranks fortieth in the United States.

Vermont's main sources of revenue are ski resorts and tourism and her small population density, high cost of fuel and raw materials, and relatively high cost of food and personal commodities do little to attract industry to the state; 41 out of 43 Vemront industries are owned by out of state concerns. With an estimated unofficial rate of unemployment Northern Vermont of 18%, Vermont is indeed in need of industry and other employment sources.

A human services program such as proposed in S.626 would have a two-fold effect. 1. Create new jobs and 2. The payroll money would multiply three times (for every dollar spent on the program, $3 would be generated in consumer's dollars, supplies).

We presently spend $400,000 a year on children in the Northeast Kingdom. The advantages of such "industry" are obvious: no heavy capital investment or operating costs; money being expended benefits the local area in terms of revitalizing the local economy; money stays within local economy; and money is being expended on services badly needed by local community.

Rural areas have particular problems germain to them and not necessarily so to other less rural areas more dense in population. Among the problems facing rural Vermont are transportation and lack of adequate physical facilities to house human service programs with efficiency and safety. In our particular Head Start Program we have 9 centers which at the two most distant points are separated by 160 miles of mountainous and winding roads, many poorly maintained during the winter months. A program, such as the Act postulates, located in such a geographical situation, requires an extensive amount of travel, especially in transportation of children to and from their homes and to medical providers. This extent of travel needs necessitates having special vehicles and adequate staffs to man them. According to the Senate Agriculture Report quoted in the Burlington Free Press on February 24, 1975, "Rural households receive less health care than the rest of America......... because physicians and other health-care workers are usually located in more densely populated areas where incomes are higher and professional ties more closely knit, rural people often have to travel distances for care......... Having more than one care is a necessity in many rural families, not an extravagance...... In some areas, it may be feasible to offer transportation services by using small vans or similar vehicles....... there may be some possibilities for adapting existing rural transport systems such as school buses". In terms of a system of child care services, it may be wise and expedient to include in grant monies appropriations for transportation vehicles and funds for staff to man them; outreach workers are indispensable.

Another characteristic problem of rural states is the absence of suitable, structually sound and safe, existing facilities to house said programs. In making funds available to said programs, money is very often necessary for construction of new physical plants and disposal systems. However, such plants should be constructed in such a manner that they can be as multi-functional as possible with an aim away from the current trend toward centralization and regionalization which currently estranges rural citizens from their local communities.

44% of all poverty in the United States is in Rural areas, however, the majority of federal programs to alleviate poverty are urban focused. According to the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity, in addition to the problems generated by rural poverty to rural areas, rural poverty aggravates urban poverty as often rural poor flock to urban areas in search of greater opportunities and services. This viscious cycle of poverty perhaps offers an even greater impetus toward concentrating more federal monies in rural areas for rural problems.

4. What I would propose as an amendment to S.626 with regard to facilities would be along the line of hospital bed constructions through the now defunct Hill-Burton Act; that is a system of outright grants and loans to local communities--and forget the complicated loan and financing system currently in S.626.

STATEMENT OF ARMIN GRAMS

PROFESSOR OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Burlington, Vermont

Before the

Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth

Pavilion Office Building, Montpelier, Vermont

April 25, 1975 1:00 P.M.

Child and Family Services Act of 1975, S.626

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee:

My name is Armin Grams and I am professor of human development and head of the Early Childhood and Human Development Program in the School of Home Economics at the University of Vermont. You are already aware that many of the professional organizations in which I hold memberships support the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. For example, at its Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. in November of 1974, the National Association for the Education of Young Children in its number one resolution endorsed the concept of the Mondale-Brademas Child and Family Services Act. As a professional concerned for almost thirty years with the well-being of children and families and more specifically for the past eighteen years with parent-child relations, child-rearing practices, and parent education I know the need that exists for comprehensive developmental child and family services. For many years I have actively supported legislation such as this and still do. As a member of one of the Forums of the 1970 White House Conference on Children, I participated in the deliberations of the conference which ultimately produced and sent on to the President of the United States a report that contained a most fervent and eloquent appeal for comprehensive and developmental programs for children and families. Were such a conference to be convened today, I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that we would again resolve overwhelmingly to support programs that the legislation we are concerned with in this testimony will enable the communities of this nation to initiate, maintain, and extend.

Having established for the record my position on S.626, let me turn to the principal charge contained in your letter inviting me to bring this testimony. In my opinion your request was a most judicious one, and I agree that while analysis of the bill is important and useful, our time might better be spent considering the manner that programs included in the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 should be implemented in a rural state like Vermont.

Before addressing myself to a number of items that deal with implementation let me make just a few general observations about the Act before us. I wish to take this occasion to commend the authors of this piece of legislation for their perceptive exposition of so complex a domain as "child and family services." The bill is truly comprehensive and appears to achieve in reality what we so often at best only approximate or at worst give mere lip service, namely a conception of whole individuals. The bill takes a genuinely "whole child" approach, and I for one am grateful that after many decades of admonition and advice, the concept seems to be understood and accepted, and in this bill, admirably expressed.

My second comment focusses on the language the bill employs when it discusses parents and family. There are numerous family forms today and this bill is worded to allow for a distinction between parenthood and parenting. It recognizes that children are cared for and loved in a variety of settings and by a variety of persons. In asserting that any person who has primary day-to-day responsibility for any child is a parent, the bill defines parenting and enables us to hope that the assistance that can be rendered by it will reach those who deserve it most. This is a most commendable feature of S.626.

One final observation deals with a potential problem. On page 27, lines 3 through 10, Sec. 106 (b) (10), we find a strongly worded charge to employ "insofar as possible" unemployed or low-income persons residing in communities served. Today, of course, there are a number of persons well trained and otherwise qualified to work with young children who are unemployed and consequently low-incomed. The provision in the bill, however, is more likely aimed at encouraging, or perhaps even mandating the use of untrained or minimally-trained persons in programs with young children. While I personally heartily endorse the concept of career development because I have seen it work here in Vermont and elsewhere, I urge an interpretation of that paragraph which accepts the view that not everyone can work successfully with young children. Good intentions are not enough. They must be combined with the right disposition (it helps a lot just to "enjoy" children) and good training. The bill provides for such training but it is incumbent upon those who implement it to avoid the harm that can sometimes be done to children by overzealous application of a principle that in general is praiseworthy, but in the specific is potentially dangerous for children. This is a matter of getting our priorities straight. The intent of the legislation before us is first to provide comprehensive developmental care for children and only secondarily to help alleviate the problem of unemployment in this nation. That the two may in some instances be related, we all recognize, but if optimal programs for children are the goals, then we must take care to put first things first.

Let us turn now, Mr. Chairman, to a consideration of how some of the programs envisioned in the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 should be implemented in Vermont. We all know that while distances here in Vermont may not be all that great in terms of miles, many families are isolated and consequently lonely. Many of these families include very young children and their mothers who are literally sentenced to each other. The major portion of the care of preschool aged children takes place in their own homes or in someone else's in the community. Although we have some good early childhood center programs and could use more, the provisions of the bill that should especially be implemented in Vermont are those dealing with care for children in their own homes and in group homes. With funds made available by this Act we can develop a network of service to the thousands of homes in this state where children and their parents are living in relative isolation, lacking among other things the stimulation of close friends and neighbors, the hope that could dispel discouragement, and the coping skills that might restore a lost sense of competence and control.

Over the past fifteen years research dealing with intervention has led with increasing clarity to the conclusion that parents are by far the most important teachers and shapers their children will ever have and that professionals can accomplish the most on behalf of young children if they make parents their ally. Helping parents to deal more effectively with the developmental process, and to provide the fundamental nurturance their child requires whether physical, emotional, social, or psychological is a most efficient means of affecting the course of their children's development. Some experimental intervention programs mistakenly by-passed the parents and concentrated on working directly with their children. Although in the short run some encouraging changes occurred, in the long run they failed because they established discontinuity between the life experience of the child and his parents.

I have long advocated parent education and I heartily endorse the emphasis that the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 places upon "family services, including in-home and in-school services, and education and consultation for parents." (P. 7, lines 21-23, Sec. 102, (b) (2) (C)) There have been times, however, when I despaired of ever being able to reach many parents in a manner and at a time that could have resulted in the greatest benefit to them and their children. I remember clearly the frustration I felt after completing a pilot project in parent education in Detroit in the early 60's. We knew, as we reported to the 1964 national convention of the American Home Economics Association and later published in the Journal of Extension Education[1] that our model was essentially correct and effective; but there seemed to be no mechanism available to establish such parent education programs in significant numbers around the country to substantially assault the cycle of poverty and failure in which so many of our fellow-citizens were caught. The essential thrust of our program was to assist young parents to deal with their preschool children in such a way that the children's chances of having successful experiences in kindergarten and the primary grades might be improved. We believed that any effort directed to "enriching" the life of the child that did not involve the parents was counterproductive because it fostered measure of discrepancy between the experience of the children and the parents. We had found that many of the parents were themselves eager for enriching experiences, and that when they had absorbed and assimilated such opportunities and in a sense "secured their gains" they willingly, even eagerly shared these with their children.

Allow me to illustrate briefly the distinction I am trying to make, and point out how the emphasis the Act places on in-home and in-school consultation and education for parents enables us to capitalize on the principle derived from our experience with such a distinction. Most enrichment programs for young children include reading stories to them. We found, however, that when the parents had a prior opportunity to become acquainted with the fascinating world that one finds within the covers of children's books they were eager to share this experience with their child. That world was no longer a foreign land that their child had visited but to which the parents, were alien. To put this in another way, we learned that our concern for young children especially those whose families are severely economically disadvantaged had to begin with concern for their parents. Many of them had experienced practically none of the sights and sounds to which some "poverty" programs were introducing their children and were somewhat resentful that no one apparently had thought to include them. Ever since that time I have advocated with increasing persistance providing parents the opportunity for experiences they can enjoy and that foster their self-esteem so that they in turn can truly share of their "abundance" with their children and not just be reminded again of how they have failed.

---

[1] Armin Grams and John G. Chantiny, "Parent Education," Journal of Cooperative Extension, 1966, 4 (2), 5-84.

The feelings of frustration I experienced as we concluded our limited pilot project were ameliorated somewhat when the local public school with which we had coordinated our efforts agreed to continue working with these families. Shortly after this, at least some of these principles were incorporated into a new and massive attack on poverty known as Head Start, and with that I experienced a sense of renewal about parent education. At last it seemed that what we believed should be done was actually feasible. The problem is national in scope; only by mounting a massive federally-funded program could we hope to solve it.

Actually this model lends itself remarkably well to a rural community. Because a large element in such programs is a one-on-one teaching situation where individual parents are given new enriching experiences, new coping skills, and new understandings of the delicate interrelationships that characterize a "whole" child's world, it has natural appeal to the sense of independence that still pervades such homes and communities. A program that aims at helping parents help their children supports such parents in their attempt to behave in a role-appropriate way and builds their sense of personal worth and self-esteem. If the public schools will coordinate their efforts with such early childhood programs, they will find that the new alliance has remarkable spin off in the school experience of the child.

Unfortunately, as I have delineated elsewhere in far greater detail,[1] we have allowed many persons to attain child bearing age convinced that this is a hostile world, and that many of its institutions, notably the schools, are oppressive and dehumanizing. Parents who themselves distrust and dislike schools cannot avoid embedding the seeds of such negative attitudes in their children.

We know from some of the community school programs however, that this can be dealt with. There are numerous examples where schools have become community centers enjoyed by citizens of all ages because they provide a wide variety of services and opportunities for personal growth and enrichment. When the school and the home become such allies good things can really begin to happen for children.

Apart from the appeal to independence, however, why should in-home and in-school services and parent education and consultation lend itself so well to a rural community? I spoke earlier of developing a network of services or a delivery system that could reach out to isolated families and help them to help themselves. You have already heard about the Cooperative Extension Service and how it is practically tailor made for this undertaking. My experience with several segments of that agency leads me to believe that close cooperation between the prime sponsor in a state like Vermont and the Cooperative Extension Service has great potential.

---

[1] Armin Grams, "Helping Parents Understand Children Better" in James L. Hymes, Jr. (Ed.), Tape of the Month in Early Childhood, Arlington, VA: Childhood Resources, Inc.

But there is yet another provision in the bill that we can capitalize on in rural America. I cannot help but be struck by the coincidence of being asked to give testimony with regard to a bill that provides for mobile units just after submitting a proposal to another funding agency for support of a mobile educational and technical assistance laboratory. Such a facility was one of the highest priority items recommended by a regional advisory committee on child care. It was made because the committee recognized the isolated nature of much of the care provided to young children in this state and the consequent unavailability of such care givers for usual in-service training or regular supplimentary training programs. Literally, it appears that if we are to provide assistance to those who care for children in their own homes, we will have to take such assistance to their doorstep.

Mobile service units, of course, are nothing new. The health professions have used them successfully for years. The state of Maine has a mobile program of training for persons who care for children in day care homes. Mobile classrooms devoted to a variety of topics have been employed over the years. Most recently we have "The Freedom Train" successfully bringing a bit of Americana to the people of this land, and it seems safe to suggest that the majority of individuals who will visit and enjoy that train might never have travelled to see the exhibits in their permanent locations.

We believe that a properly equipped mobile unit could provide a variety of stimulating educational experiences for parents and other care givers who hardly ever get out from under the heavy demands that child rearing in isolated rural settings makes upon their time and energy. Such a unit could serve to relieve the parents for some adult experiences that many of them crave and in the long run would make them more effective in their relationships with their children. The variety of needs that could be met is almost unlimited, but they come readily to mind when one focusses on conditions that frequently limit a parent's mobility. Allow me just briefly to mention two such circumstances or conditions.

Parents of handicapped young children are in particular need of companionship and assistance. The bill, of course, encourages services to such children, but again in many instances only certain kinds of handicapped children are reached through center-based programs, and little or no assistance has been available to other handicapped children and their parents.

Still another factor that often sharply limits a parent's options is the presence of a very young child in the home. Again, the literature in child development clearly establishes the importance of the quality of the environment during this crucial period, and the bill before us wisely supports programs that include such services. A mobile unit for service in this area could bring a variety of professionals and paraprofessionals into direct contact with individuals who can benefit from them. Health, nutrition, as well as the broader area of infant and toddler rearing, and marital relationships are some of the immediate and pressing concerns of families with very young children to which mobile programs supported by the bill could respond.

School based programs of parent and preparent education are also important aspects of the bill that have immediate applicability to a rural state like Vermont. Were schools, especially high schools, to incorporate child care programs into the curriculum, a number of interesting corollaries, might surface. In the first place, dealing directly with 3 and 4 year-olds and sharing even briefly some of the responsibility for their care is a sobering experience for many young people. Followed by discussions of the pros and cons of child-bearing and child rearing, such experiences might enable potential parents to make a reasonable choice rather than a "fadish" one.

Because pregnant students are increasingly encouraged to remain in school, a meaningful and timely program of expectant parent education can be a part of the curriculum. The benefits to their peers who are not pregnant is also clearly a factor to be considered.

Finally, I would stress the importance for Vermont of the bill's provision of funds for research. We know pitifully little about the quality of both real-parent as well as supplemental child care in Vermont. I have in my file a proposal that I submitted two years ago for Hatch Act Experiment Station research funds entitled "A Study of Supplementary Child Care in Rural Communities." Due to the sharp limitation of all research support these days, the proposal could not be funded. Some years before that I designed a study of the developmental status of young rural children, and that proposal met a similar fate. We need desperately to reaffirm our belief in sound social science research, and I am pleased that The Child and Family Services Act of 1975 recognizes this need and makes substantial provision for meeting it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the invitation to submit this testimony.

STATEMENT OF GLADYS B. JAMESON

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN THE SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Burlington, Vermont

Before the

Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth

Pavilion Office Building, Montpelier, Vermont

April 25, 1975 1:00 P.M.

Child and Family Services Act of 1975, S.626

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am Gladys Jameson. I am an Assistant Professor in the Early Childhood and Human Development Program in the School of Home Economics at the University of Vermont.

In my role at the University, I am involved in the training of students who wish to enter the helping professions, working with young children and their families. I am also involved in outreach as the University attempts to meet the needs of professionals and para-professionals who are at work in Vermont.

Because you have asked that we address our testimony to the way that child and family services should be implemented in a state like Vermont, I think that it would be helpful for you to know that I have been a resident of Vermont for almost thirty years, and was graduated from The University of Vermont in 1949.

Prior to my appointment to the faculty of UVM in the Fall of 1968, I served Vermont as a public school teacher, as administrator and Supervisor of Chittenden East Headstart in the first summer of the program's operation, as an instructor in the Adult Basic Education Program, as the founder and teacher-director of the Saxon Hill School in Jericho, as a staff member (Ripton) of the COPA Program during the first year of the New York-Vermont Project, and for three years as President of the Vermont Association for Childhood Education. These experiences have kept me in touch with the needs and potentials of Vermont and Vermonters.

I would like to begin by commending the writers of Senate Bill S.626 on their definition of the term "parent." Implicit in the phrase - "any person who has sole day-to-day responsibility for any child" - is a more flexible, a more functional, a more humane perception of just what a family is all about.

My testimony, Mr. Chairman, will focus on the needs of children and families for programs before - and after-school and during the summer AND on efforts to extend all service gains into Kindergarten and the early years of school.

First, let us look at some of the needs of young children and their families, especially as we find them in rural Vermont.

By the time a child is ready to enter school, he is becoming less concerned with himself and more concerned with others. He is interested in doing things - in accomplishing. He finds satisfaction in learning new knowledge and skills. He feels rewarded by cooperating on projects with other children his age. He needs to prove himself in a group of peers.

In urban or suburban communities, children are able to form spontaneous peer groups. The childhood experiences which are important for social growth and development - "secret clubs," after supper games of kick-the-can, spending the night at a friend's house, ball games - happen more easily when children can walk to the playground, meet in the neighborhood, or walk to each others' homes or apartments. In rural areas, children are isolated from one another... except for the time they spend in school. Much of that time is structured and geared toward cognitive growth and development, often at the expense of social growth.

Just as rural children are isolated from one another, so are rural adults. Those who are employed outside the home have the advantage of interaction with others during part of their week. But they have the burden of long hours of commuting time and of worrying about the welfare of their children when school is not in session. As an illustration I am reminded of some fine people from the Starksboro-Monkton area I worked with some years ago. They had to leave their homes before dawn in order to pick up riders and be at work in Middlebury on time. During the long winter months they arrived back home well after dark. Parents of children I have taught, frequently made arrangements with me to drop children off at school early so that they could get to work on time. Even when I arrived at school as early as 7:45 A.M. for bus duty, I found regularly a child whose parents needed to drop him off early, huddled in the doorway of the school in an attempt to keep warm.

We can argue as to whether or not his mother should have been working. But the argument, in most cases, is fruitless. She was working. She had needs - the child had needs - the family had needs. In Vermont these needs are made more critical by the factors of geographic isolation and intemperate weather conditions. And, when families are poor, their psychological and physical resources - as well as their financial resources - are truly impoverished. Certainly, it is the mark of a humane and caring society to provide the support services that these children and their families need.

Second, let us look at how we might best meet these particular needs in rural Vermont.

We would suggest to you that significant progress is possible if we can begin to conceptualize our existing public education system as the basis for a caring community - providing a network of support services for children and their families.

May I direct your attention to some statistics which would suggest that we are close to the point of moving into available space? Very recently, in an article on the front page of The New York Times, Leonard Buder wrote:

> "Prompted by declining enrollments and a need to cut costs, the Board of Education is planning to close as many as 40 school buildings by June, 1976, and take other measures to use its buildings more efficiently.
>
> The expected school closings will mark the first time within memory of Headquarters personnel that the city system will be giving up so many buildings because of diminishing number of pupils."[1]

Similarly, Engelhardt, an education and school management consultant, states:

> "Between now and 1980 public school enrollments will probably decrease by 10 percent. In a random sampling of ten school districts that had competent enrollment forecasts, two predicted any increase. The other eight districts forecast probable losses of 14 to 30 percent."[2]

The idea of using our existing education system as a community center is not new with this testimony. Right here in Vermont, for example, the Village of Essex Junction named its new secondary facility "The Essex Junction Educational Center" instead of using the term "High School." This reflects a society which is beginning to view its responsibilities and potentials in a new way.

Vermont is organized into some 55 Supervisory School Unions or Districts. By using the Union or District as a prime sponsor, we could utilize the existing system and avoid adding another layer of beaurocracy. Space, equipment, and buses, instead of lying unused so much of the time, could see more efficient service; and the time and talent of some school personnel more effectively utilized.

---

[1] Leonard Buder. The Sunday New York Times (April 13, 1975). P. 1.

[2] Nicolaus Engelhardt. Saturday Review World, June 1, 1974. P. 54.

Because this would increase the numbers of hours in a day, days in a week, and weeks in a year that the existing system could be used, additional professional, para-professional, and maintainence staff would be needed in order to implement before - and after - school and summer programs. In no way should the addition of these programs further tax the time and energies of those persons already employed by the education system.

Perhaps the greatest potential for a truly community school program lies in the Bill's explicit requirement that each prime sponsor shall establish and maintain a Child and Family Service Council. The composition and responsibilities of that Council, as detailed in Sec. 105, suggest exciting possibilities for making some significant changes in the quality and the direction of public education in our state.

Increasingly I am hearing that the gains children make in our private and public early childhood development programs are "wiped-out" anywhere between the middle of the first and the third year of public school. If this is true - and the assertion originates with public school officials - then I am very disturbed. We must ask ourselves "why?"

I believe that a part of the answer lies in the fact that as we move from preschool to grade school the focus often switches sharply from child development to education. We have all met situations where our needs as human beings were subordinated to those of the very institutions designed to meet them. Hospitals, schools, and other agencies are often operated more for the convenience of those operating them than to meet the human needs of their clients.

Those of us in early childhood development - especially with a home economics orientation - are very aware of and sensitive to the fact that we are going to be effective in increasing the quality of human development only to the degree that we concern ourselves with all of the dimensions of human life. A child is not simply a cognitive being who enters our school each day to learn - separate from his family. He is his family - and he brings with him that family, its needs, values and ideas. Our challenge lies in developing the kinds of communication and respect necessary to help the child and his family learn how to meet their needs - and to express their wishes - and to develop themselves.

I view the inclusion of the Child and Family Service Council - with its membership of parents of the disadvantaged, handicapped, rural, or minority child - as one of the most exciting break-throughs possible. The fact that "at least one person who is particularily skilled by virtue of training or experience in child and family services" is to serve on this Council enriches its potential. Certainly, the road will not be smooth as Union or District administrators and school directors begin to work with a council such as this. But, then, many of us in human development are used to climbing mountains and crossing turbulent rivers as, I am sure, most of you in this room are. How does the saying go? "Getting there is half the fun."

There are two other points I would like to touch on briefly before I conclude. We very much need to provide the option of preschool experiences for all Vermont's children. Another reason that early childhood gains are "wiped-out" is that the overworked public school teacher is asked to deal with too many children, each coming to school with very divergent backgrounds in group experiences outside the home. For example - one of our recent graduates was hired as a first year teacher in a Vermont public school kindergarten. Each day she relates to 50 children. Some have had very rich backgrounds in terms of stimulation in the home and preschool experiences. Other children have lived in a rather stimulus-impoverished environment until now. How can she possibly challenge the former and nurture the latter - and have everyone move ahead at the same pace? The answer is, of course - she can't. Thus - gains are "wiped-out."

Senate Bill S. 626 specifically states that child and family services are "to assist parents who request such services." Our experience in Vermont suggests that they will indeed request them, for you will find that whenever a community has incorporated kindergarten into its system of public education - even though it is not mandatory for each child - there is an almost 100% enrollment of eligible children. I am convinced that the Child and Family Services Council could be instrumental in helping us institute preschool programs for all children in our schools.

My second - and last - point is that the education (and I use the term in its broad, developmental context) - the education of our children is big business and is inextricably tied to our economy. Our economy is a part of the fabric of our entire society and culture. When we pull a thread here, or add a stitch there - we change the design, sometimes in small ways - sometimes in ways we had not expected - but there is a dynamic of change involved. As we are trying to shift - on ecological grounds - to a culture which produces less goods and more services, we must be aware of the possibilities open to us as well as to the implications of our decisions.

Those of us involved in the professional training of "teachers" have long realized that this label may soon join the rank of obsolete words. To quote Barrington Nevitt:

> "In future, continuing education for the whole community will try to meet the needs of all who wish to learn, rather than aiming merely to satisfy the demands for accreditation based upon well established, but no longer valid, criteria. We can foresee individual home-study centers and a multiplicity of other centers shared by the community for meeting people, for using special facilities, for doing things together, for research and development projects, and for stimulating dialogue."[1]

---

[1] Nevitt, Barrington, "Problems of Communicating with People through Media," THE (Bell Northern Research 1968).

We must address ourselves to the task of funding programs developed and staffed to meet the needs of a society which is making some major changes in its design. I feel that this Bill is a positive move in the direction of the necessary planning we must do.

I would like to close on a personal note, if I may. I live what is termed an alternate life-style. I am a single parent of five children. I can tell you how it is - to reach out constantly for physical and emotional support because you realize that there is no way that you and those children are going to make it alone. I have been more fortunate than most women in my position in that I have an abundance of personal resources in a close community of friends and colleagues, some skills that led me to a good job and its accompanying financial security, and a wonderful group of teachers and adult leaders who have helped me rear my children.

Not all families are as fortunate. They need help - real help - the kind of help that Senate Bill S. 676 can provide. If the members of Congress and the President of the United States don't know this - then I suggest that they make it their business to be informed at the grass roots level as to where our priorities must lie. As busy as we are here in Vermont - trying to hold our corner of the world together - we'd be willing to pile a few national leaders into a bus and take them to see a rural Vermont that you don't see on travel posters and post cards!

I wish to thank all of you on the Subcommittee for inviting me to make a statement. I hope what I have said has been of some help. Good luck.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY ON S 626
THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE ACT

1. The development of healthy children is the essence of all preventive programs in human service. If we want to lower crime, prevent institutionalization in mental hospitals, contribute to better physical health for our citizens, all programs must start with children.

In the past we have spent inordinate amounts of money on treatment, waiting until the child or adult developed problems, then attempting to provide a cure. In all the human service fields in the long run, this has proved to be a necessary but inefficient expenditure of funds. Curative measures, after the fact, are rarely as satisfactory as prevention.

What is heartening about this bill is that it is a true, comprehensive program for prevention of problems.

2. There is a certain ease to treatment when one deals with children, and I am speaking now of the pre-adolescent child. First of all, the clay has not baked. A change for the better in the environment more often than not produces a change for the better in the child. Poor personal habits have not been so formed as to be triggered constantly and inappropriately as in adults. Children are appealing to work with; they motivate the treatment team. Parents are strongly attached to children and in this role are motivated to change patterns of behavior with the help of others as long as they are not personally threatened. There are naturally exceptions to these rules, but by and large one finds that the earlier one gets to the problem, the quicker it is resolved and the longer the results are sustained.

3. One important aspect of this bill is the education of parents. Such education cannot be stressed enough; First of all so many problems of children could be alleviated if some parents changed only slightly in their child-rearing practices. How often we hear a parent, after the fact, wishing that they had only known a few years before that certain attitudes were destructive to one of their children. Second, education is a non-threatening way of changing parents' behavior. They can make changes for the future without publicly admitting problems in the past. I hope this part of the bill will receive emphasis in implementation.

4. I feel one aspect of the grant, though implied, needs more emphasis, especially for a rural state like Vermont. It concerns service delivery and is based on experience; namely, that when the service is convenient to the recipient, it is both more readily received and accepted. In the case of Vermont, services should be delivered in the community, or grouping of communities, where the recipient lives. If possible, in the homes of the recipient. In the face of poor funding, over-"professionalism," and bare-bones efficiency measures, we have always tended to provide services at a "center." While it is true that we have been forced to maximize our staff time through these methods, this bill, in its comprehensive aspects, can allow us to do away with this practice and all the theoretical rationalization that goes with it. I would like to see this concept of "get the professional where the problem is, rather than get the problem where the professional sits" spelled out as a priority.

5. Finally, I have a warning. This is just another bill, under the guise of being Comprehensive in its approach if the prime sponsor does not provide coordination of services between service providing agencies. If coordination is not obviously mandated by the act, then evaluated and then sanctioned with penalities, I do not think you will do anything more than provide a lot of money for a lot more programs that "grow like Topsy." That's all right and it's better than nothing but I don't think that was your intent. Neither the prime sponsor not the Service Council alone can stop this. You may allow the prime sponsor to work out whatever arrangement it will between agencies, but if it is not spelled out in the bill and obviously sanctioned, the concept of "coordination" will evaporate.

Roger Strauss
Executive Director
Washington County Mental Health Services

STATEMENT OF SIGNE BETSINGER

DIRECTOR OF THE SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

Burlington, Vermont

Before the

Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth

Pavilion Office Building, Montpelier, Vermont

April 25, 1975 1:00 P.M.

Child and Family Services Act of 1975, S.626

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am Signe Betsinger, Director of the School of Home Economics at The University of Vermont. This school trains students to work as home economists in preschool, middle, and secondary schools; Cooperative Extension; business; industry, and community agencies dealing with child care, nutrition, housing, clothing and consumer problems. As a member of the American Home Economics Association I am one of the many thousands of members of that organization who support Federal Legislation for child care programs. In 1973, the AHEA House of Delegates adopted a resolution concerning the need for the services and programs that are put forth in the S.626 bill. I appreciate the invitation to speak in support of this bill because I believe that child care legislation should be one of the top priorities in this country.

I am particularly pleased with the manner in which the bill defines parents. As a home economist I am supportive of a definition of family which includes the wide range of patterns from traditional to alternative settings. There can be no doubt that families will continue to be in transition and that therefore, child care will need to respond to this.

Because changes are brought about by forces of many kinds, international, national, state, and particularly by what happens or does not happen in the local community, I would urge that, in designing comprehensive child care, every attempt be made to build upon the existing strengths on the local level and make use of the talents and facilities already there. Throughout the state of Vermont there are 64 high schools with Consumer Homemaking Education programs enrolling both male and female students in courses dealing with learning parenting, child care, family life, nutrition, housing, clothing, home management, and consumer problems. There are also 15 Area Vocational Centers offering occupational home economics programs; most of them focus on the preparation of paraprofessionals in child care. In these home economics departments in the school systems there are laboratories and often child care facilities which could be utilized for meeting the needs of children and families for before - and - after school and summer programs.

Although the use of existing child care facilities is a rather obvious approach, what may not be so obvious is that the other laboratories in the home economics departments have a great deal of potential for providing training, for example, in nutrition. Any well designed nutrition education program which aims to help reduce malnutrition should have a practical component. There should be an opportunity for hands-on experiences. This means there should be some actual food preparation which in turn means that some equipment for cooking and the sanitary storage of food should be available. Facilities of these kinds are all over the state of Vermont. In every school system with a federally approved home economics department the home economics teacher is certified and can be a resource person. One will find often in rural areas it is this teacher to whom adults in the community turn for answers to homemaking problems.

The Cooperative Extension Service is another place to which questions are referred often. Already existing in Vermont is a network of county offices staffed by home economics specialists who for years have provided education in rural areas in an informal and individualized way. Family living, child care, and nutrition and health are important foci in Extension programs of work.

I am pleased to know that the Child and Family Services Act places a strong emphasis on comprehensive services which include not only the children but adults in their lives who care for them. By linking up with the two systems I have referred to here, the local school and the Cooperative Extension Service, to help in the delivery of the services proposed in the bill, I believe there is great potential for developing an approach which will truly make an impact.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony.

Statement prepared by Gordon Walker, Chairman for Manchester Child Development Center Board of Directors.

Presentation at Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee Hearings on S.626

I want to thank Senator Stafford for the opportunity to state the views of the Manchester Child Development Center concerning child care services in a rural environment.

The Manchester Child Development Center serves six outlying towns including Manchester. Transporting children from those towns is one of our greatest needs. Although at present we are purchasing a mini-bus with Title IVA funds, the contract ends in June and additional funds are needed to cover maintenance, gas and driver costs if we are to continue this service. It is my understanding that appropriations for the fiscal year 1976 have not been allocated. In addition to transporting children to and from the center, the bus is used for field trips, swimming classes and food deliveries. This same problem of providing social services to rural residents plaques other Human Services Agencies. An example of this is programs designed to serve the elderly. Combining funds and service among various agencies would seem to be cost efficient and provide a broader range of service.

Another area of immediate concern in which your support and cooperation would be essential is with the Child Nutrition Bills presently before Congress. Many of our children come from low income families. They are often undernourished and in need of basic nutritional requirements. Our food program is very costly and has operated in the red almost throughout the center's history. Inflation obviously has put an extra strain on the food budget, and we feel additional funds are necessary. Day care centers must meet the same nutritional requirements as public schools, but they receive only half the money. Our costs are the same if not higher, since we are unable to purchase large bulk quantities.

Another major concern and probably our most complex is working with the attitudes of rural people, particularly natives. Our experience in Manchester and outlying communities has been a continual battle of trying to educate people concerning the objectives of day care, for whom the services are designed. Although there seems to be increasing support and utilization of day care facilities, it falls far short of being sufficient to maintain a steady financial base. These attitudes coupled with the depressed economic situation in rural America create financial hardship.

-2-

With fewer working parents, the benefits of day care are never fully appreciated. Since many centers are dependent upon reimbursement of Title IVA funds for normal operation, when unemployment is high, fewer and fewer low-income people have jobs and therefore enrollment at day care centers depreciates, setting off administrative headaches regarding staff, paying bills and future plans. If day care were to receive larger reimbursements of Title IVA funds during periods of high unemployment, the disastrous effects of a poor economy would not be as harsh.

Also, if the new legislation proposed were to provide funds for publicizing day care via television, this would definitely be useful in overcoming much of the confusion that presently exists and would assist in legitimizing the activities of day care centers.

The function of day care, besides providing regular and excellent daytime care, is to prepare children for entering kindergarten. In order to perform this task adequately, additional funds are needed to provide learning materials, audio-visual aids and other supplies. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare studies have shown that children with preschool background have much better success socially as wess as academically once joining the public school system. These and other statistics express our feelings that is is important that day care be viewed favorably in the allocation of public monies so that it may continue its programs so desperately needed if everyone in this country is to have an equal opportunity to express his physical and mental skills. Adults as well as children are provided such opportunity by an active program of day care.

Senator Stafford. Thank you, again, very much for going to all the trouble to come. This subcommittee will stand adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

[Whereupon at 5:20 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at 9 a.m. Saturday, April 26, 1975, in the Pavilion State Office Building (auditorium), Montpelier, Vt.]

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT, 1975

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1975

U.S. Senate,
Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Montpelier, Vt.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9 a.m. in the Pavilion State Office Building [auditorium], Senator Robert T. Stafford presiding pro tempore.

Present: Senator Stafford.

Committee staff members present: A. Sidney Johnson, professional staff member; Larry Greenberg, minority counsel; and Michael A. Francis, legislative aide to Senator Stafford.

Senator **Stafford**. The Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth will come to order. I will say good morning to all who are here. We appreciate your joining us.

This morning we will begin the second day of our hearing in Vermont on S. 626, the Child and Family Service Act.

Today's hearings take on extra importance because most of those Vermonters who will testify are parents of children who are served by child care programs in our State.

The role of the parent in programs designed to serve children and young people is of particular importance to this Senator, indeed as it is to all of the members of this subcommittee.

What role should the parent assume in the day-to-day operation of programs designed to provide child care?

We have come to Vermont to ask parents how they would answer this question. We have come here to ask for advice and help in our task of writing legislation designed to provide better services for children and young people.

Information gathered by virtually every arm of the Federal Government clearly indicates a need for more and better child care programs.

In shaping the legislation before us, we are most interested in improving the quality of this service. I am convinced that the contribution of parents is critical to improvement in quality. The legislation before us is also concerned with the effort to strengthen the American family at a time when the family often seems to be the target of assault from many quarters.

Anthropologist Margaret Mead, in testimony before this subcommittee, reminded us that many actions of the Federal Government have added to that assault—and that legislation ranging from tax laws to social service programs all have some effect upon the family, and that effect is not always helpful.

Indeed, she once suggested it might be a good idea to require a family impact statement with all Federal legislation, just as we require an impact statement in evironmental matters.

We in the Congress, however, are not yet ready to require family impact statements in our legislation, but I want you to know that I consider the testimony we are about to hear from Vermont parents and others involved in day care programs to be among the most valuable testimony we will receive in the preparation of this legislation.

All to often, Federal legislators fail to realize that the key to the success or failure of legislative goals lies not in the language of the law, but in the performance of Americans all across this great Nation in carrying out that language and that purpose.

We are here today, ladies and gentlemen, to ask your help, and to assure you that your contributions to us during these proceedings will be invaluable to the subcommittee, the full committee and the Senate.

Before we call the first panel for the morning, let the Chair announce that there will be one change in our schedule. Between panels 3 and 4, we propose to insert a new panel of people who requested yesterday to be allowed to testify. Without objection, the Chair will make a statement of Signe Betsinger, director of the School of Home Economics, University of Vermont, a part of the record yesterday and in a position appropriate to be with the other members of the panel for which she was originally scheduled. (See appendix F attached to the transcript of April 25.) The Chair would also advise participants this morning first that the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, consistent with the parent committee and general practice in Senate committees, will ask witnesses to please confine their remarks to as near to 5 minutes each as possible. If there are written statements of length, the Chair will put those statements in the record verbatim and ask that they be summarized by the witnesses within as nearly a 5-minute limit as possible.

Finally, the subcommittee proposes to keep the record open on these hearings for another couple of weeks in order to permit anybody who wishes to submit a written statement and has not had an opportunity to do so to send that statement to the subcommittee in Washington for inclusion in the record. Additionally, the subcommittee members may have questions after analysis of the testimony which we are receiving here, which we may send to selected members of the panels that have appeared in front of us for written response in the hope that if we take that course, you will be willing to respond in writing.

Now, the subcommittee is prepared to hear the first panel, a panel of day care board members. We know that Mr. Giancola is here. Are there other members of that panel who are present? Mr. Colin Ducolon, Ms. Marguerite Stearns, any or all of those who are here, would you kindly come forward to the witness table. Welcome to the hearings before the Subcommittee on Children and Youth on S. 626. The microphone in front of you is for preparing a record of these proceedings and is not necessarily attached to any public address system in the room. So, if you will speak loud enough so that those in the back rows can hear you, I am sure that they will appreciate it. The subcommittee will invite you to proceed in whichever order of precedence you may agree upon.

Panel of Board Members of Day Care Centers

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH GIANCOLA, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SUGAR MAPLE CHILDREN'S CENTER, RUTLAND, VT.

Mr. GIANCOLA. Good morning ladies and gentlemen, Senator Stafford. My name is Joseph Giancola. I am a realtor, builder, developer. I am president of the Giancola Construction Corp. I am the newly elected president of the Rutland Region Chamber of Commerce, and also the president of the Sugar Maple Children's Center Board of Directors and one of its original founders. Senator, I want to thank you for the opportunity to let us come here, and for you to take your time to come to Vermont. We at Sugar Maple commend you for your voting record on children and youth. We have researched your record and if you were a baseball player, you would be batting 1,000.

Senator, I am going to apologize for not having a printed statement here because of my schedule. I am going to try to give you a businessman's outlook as to how I see it in 5 minutes, if I can.

The council that you proposed in your bill has educators, mental health people, but it does not have the businessman on that board. I say that you need the businessman mainly because he is the man who the people work for who have their children in the centers, and also he keeps the stability on the board for profit and loss and expenditures. That is one of the main objections I have to that council as it is being set up.

Now, we get to the need in the day care center. Senator, we need a balance between the educated child, the child from the poor family, and the child from the middle income and all various incomes. As the program has been set up in the past, there is no balance. The only way that we at Sugar Maple could achieve a balance is by having a private fee nursery school. We believe that children learn what they live and the only way they are going to learn from the other children and fit into society is to have this mix. Therefore, I believe that you should expand your income limits for funding to a higher limit to include that middle-income American, and that will give us the balance in the centers that we are going to need.

Also, we feel that if a child does not get that early preschool education, all through his life until he gets out of school, he is never going to catch up, he is always behind. I know this from experience, Senator.

We get to the cost of operating a center, it runs between $35 to $40 a month at our center. We have people who pay $20 and the local community has picked up the gap. That is the only way that we can keep open. Also, with the surplus food drying up, we have to take into consideration additional funding for dietary programs. We have been able to keep our budgets low because of the surplus food that we have been able to acquire, but I feel that the way that has been going, that will dry up. A big item is transportation. The children have to be brought to school in the morning and distributed at odd hours to many, many different schools in an area. In Vermont, the schools we serve are usually scattered as much as 10 miles apart. The parents bring the children in the morning, go to work, and we take them from there until the evening and have to transport them. Money should be put in there for vehicles or some sort of transportation allowance.

A big thing when you get a program is that you give the money for the program, but not sufficient amounts of money for capital expenditures for buildings and things of that nature which, somehow, there never seems to be enough. The original grant for day care was like a $2,500 seed grant. You know, you can't open the doors to anything with that.

One of the disheartening things that I see is that I am in the construction business where you have high salaries. My staff at Sugar Maple works for just above minimum wage. It really bothers me, Senator, that I have to have those people and they cannot live on dedication all the time because it only goes so far—degreed people. I feel that State boards of education should stay out of it, mainly because the school system is a different type of program completely. It has a high bureaucracy; it has established its own priorities already. I think it should be run similar to the Office of Child Development with a director, four or five on a secretarial staff to handle the paper work. I feel the licensing people in Vermont should be paid by the State of Vermont. If they want to make the regulations, they should pay to have them enforced. If the fire marshal in the State of Vermont wants the regulations met because they vary from State to State, the fire marshal, as it has been doing in the past, should pay for its own inspectors to go around and do the inspections and be attached to the Office of Child Development.

One of the things that we have here in Vermont is that when the legislature passes a bill, department heads seem to circumvent the legislature's intent. I guess that is human nature. The Federal Director of HEW who administers this program, or that council, should have some latitude, somehow written into this bill, so that each geographical area, as the need arises, as things change, should be able to take and make the necessary changes for the geographical area through that council or meeting and not have to go through a lot of red tape to do it. I could go on, Senator, but I think that is as much as I can get in in 5 minutes.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Giancola. We will invite the next member of the panel, whichever cares to go forward.

STATEMENT OF MARGUERITE B. STEARNS, CONSUMER CONTROLLED COMMUNITY CHILD CARE, INC., SPRINGFIELD, VT.

Ms. STEARNS. I am Marguerite Stearns, and I am here representing the Consumer Controlled Community Child Care, Inc. of Springfield, Vt. For about 20 years, I have worked with children and with families from deprived situations. I worked as a child care worker in the State of Vermont. I saw the poverty, I saw the neglect, and I saw parents who were trying very hard to give their children a good start in life, to give them a good educational background. After I left child services, I worked for the Windham County Mental Health and I worked primarily with children who were developmentally disabled and saw what had happened because of the lack of good preschool care, good nutrition and good education. I think that I will just read for the record.

For the past 17 years I have worked with families of deprived, neglected, abused and developmentally disabled children in the State of Vermont. During this time I have seen the lack of preventative services for families throughout the area, and have deplored the costs of rehabilitative services to the taxpayers, and the emotional damage suffered by parents and children.

It has been my feeling over the years that most parents provide the best care, parenting, and education that they are capable of giving. However, we have a rather unique situation in Vermont—with a rural area, lack of public transportation, few opportunities for socialization, vocational training, and diversified employment—most of our low-income people tend to remain in the same area where they grew up, marry young, and provide little more in material or emotional care than they received as children.

When I was asked by the parents of 5–C to be on their policy council, I was enthusiastic to learn more of their organization and to be of assistance to it.

As I have become better acquainted with the staff, the parents, and the children, I have become increasingly impressed with the Head Start program in this area. The staff is a dedicated, hard-working group who provide a good educational experience to the children, and offer their expertise in child rearing to the parents. I want to expand on this just a little bit, and I want to emphasize the previous panel member. I am very, very impressed with the expertise of the teachers and of the staff. I deplore the poor salaries they receive. I feel that unless more money comes into this program that the quality of teachers is not going to be able to be sustained. As the parents have become more knowledgeable, they have become more confident of their abilities, and have been able to give their children better care.

The proposal on the Child and Family Services Act makes reference to a new service which will provide comparable services to those now provided in part by Head Start. It would seem more feasible, more economical, and more productive to enlarge upon the present Head Start program, so that a better program can be established, and so that more low-income and middle-income people may be served in a good preventative program.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF COLIN DUCOLON, BOARD MEMBER, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CORP., BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. **Ducolon**. I am Colin Ducolon, board member of the Champlain Valley Family Development Corporation in Burlington. I have been a former Head Start director in Vermont; an assistant Head Start regional training director in Maryland; I taught child development in a 2-year college in New York, and I am now teaching at Champlain College in Burlington, and last, and by no means least, I am the parent of a 6-month-old girl, who may be taking advantage of these services some day. So, I think I have seen the need for the services and hope to speak to them very briefly.

I have presented some written testimony, but I just would like to point out two concerns I have about the present bill. First is the organization of the services, how they will be provided to the parents and the families in local communities; and second, the need for trained personnel, trained staff to operate the services.

First of all, in the organization, I am not quite clear as to how the statewide organization would be set up, but it seems to be suggested in the bill that it might be operated through the present Office of Child Development with a new title. I would seriously question that. I do not think that the child development programs need another bureaucracy to operate them. I think they need to be controlled locally. And when I say locally, that may be community based, it may be county based, and it may be several counties coming together. I don't think we need a statewide bureaucracy to organize the services.

Second, the training of personnel and staff to work in programs. I think that the Head Start programs have been very good and many good things have happened from Project Head Start. However, one of the difficulties I think we had when I was working in Head Start and continues to be somewhat of a difficulty is for an organized training plan for people who work with children. Very often it has been spotty, disorganized and not very well thought through. I think that there is a need for some real skills in working with children. I think love and concern are very important, but I think there are some skills that need to be developed. Skills that many people do have, but may need some training to further develop them. Those would be the two main points, the organization of the services and the training of the staff to work in them. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Ducolon. Your full statement will be made a part of the record. Mr. Giancola, if you have something further that you would like to add in view of the brevity of your colleagues, the Chair will entertain it, or if you wish to submit a further statement in writing later, the Chair will see that that is made a part of the record, whichever you prefer.

Mr. GIANCOLA. There are just two quick statements, Senator. One, keep in mind that Vermont is a small State. I can make a phone call from Rutland or from Burlington and get someone in Montpelier for either a matter or meeting or something, so, possibly I think that statewide the organization can handle its own. Secondly, be careful, Senator, of more investigations and more reports and more kinds of written data on children. I have seen so much of it, and every time we see it, it doesn't pertain to Vermont.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you. We will keep that in mind. We have noted that it is quite possible for Vermonters to get on the telephone and call Washington just about as easily as they call Montpelier. I think that for the benefit of those who are here, that I should note that the people with me this morning are the subcommittee's Staff Director Sid Johnson, who is sitting on my immediate left, and Larry Greenburg, who is the subcommittee's minority counsel; just to Sid's left, Mike Francis of my own staff, who is a native of Rutland, incidentally, on my immediate right, and Claire Glen, who is the subcommittee's secretary, behind the table. We thank the panel again for going to the trouble of coming here and joining us this morning.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Ducolon and Mr. Walker follows:]

April 28, 1975

Honorable Robert T. Stafford
United States Senate

It is a pleasure to be invited to present testimony in support of the Child and Family Services Act of 1975, S. 626.

From my experiences as a former Vermont Head Start Director, an assistant Head Start Regional Training Officer in Maryland, and as early childhood educator in New York and now in Vermont; I have seen the need for quality child and family services programs.

I am impressed with a federal bill which proposes to "build upon and strengthen family life and to insure decision-making at the community level, with direct participation of the parents of the children served".

The parent -- mother and/or father -- is the child's first teacher, providing live, security, trust, guidance and support. This relationship between parent and child satisfies the child's basic needs. The proposed bill, with adequate funding and perceptive adminstration, can support this family relationship.

Alfred Adler has formulated what might possibly be termed the first social law --"the law of equality, the ironclad logic of social living which demands recognition of every human being as equal". Rudolf Dreikurs has continued with Adler's philosophy stating that "resistance is building up to the old and new forms of domination, and that resistance follows similar tactics wherever the suppressed, neglected, or disrespected claim their equal right and value'. Hopefully, S. 626 will provide the equal decision-making voice for the disadvantaged parents at the local community level. All too often direction and administration has been assigned to high officials with little input from those people being directed and served. It happens in government, in schools and colleges, and even in families. Parents should have and deserve a voice in the organization and implementation of a service plan for them and their children. I trust that this bill will emphasize such "equality" and "decision-making" for parents. Vermonters know how to articulate their needs if given a chance!

It does not seem necessary to point out the need for quality child development programs. Benjamin Bloom, Piaget and many others have made us aware of the importance of the early years in the development of our intellectual, social, emotional, and physical abilities. Selma Fraiberg has termed then the "magic years"--years when the child's potential for development is laid down and the pattern for a child's approach to his environment is established.

It does seem necessary to point out the need for trained personnel to staff such Child and Family Services Programs. Basic knowledge in child development, health and nutrition, early childhood curriculum planning, and total family needs and services is necessary for all who are to work with such a program. Title IV of the bill seems to speak to the need for trained personnel.

Adequately trained and supervised staff has not always been a priority item for child development programs in the past. Training has often been spotty and disorganized in Vermont. Vermont is a rural state for the most part. Transportation is a real problem. A training plan that is centered in one location and expects child development staff and parents to "come to it" is not realistic or sensible for Vermont. Decentralized, well-planned, organized and career-based training is needed. Resources are available at local community levels and they should be utilized. Another state-wide bureaucracy for training would not be beneficial to most staff and parents in local programs.

The proposed bill could benefit Vermont and its people. It could strengthen family life. It could enhance decision-making at the local level. It could mean direct participation by parents of children served. These needs could best be met through community based programs. Our present state Office of Child Development has not always helped local communities meet their needs. I question the wisdom of delegating such authority to the Office again.

Head Start programs have met a real need in Vermont. I believe that this new Child and Family Services Program should build on what has been established by local Head Start programs throughout Vermont. Coordination at community or county level would seem most beneficial to families and less costly to taxpayers. Head Start directors and parents have the resources and the knowledge. Provide them with adequate funding, well-planned training and support AND "family life should be strengthened, local decision-making should continue, and parents will be encouraged to participate.

Thank You

Colin K. Duclon Burlington, Vt.

Senator STAFFORD. The next panel will be Ms. Alice Angney and Mrs. Henry Stambler, parents of handicapped children. If they are in the room, we invite them to come forward. Ladies, we appreciate your joining us this morning to help us in this task of preparing a workable bill. As we have in the past, we will ask you to proceed in whichever order of precedence you may decide on.

STATEMENT OF MS. ALICE ANGNEY, PARENT OF A HANDICAPPED CHILD, MONTPELIER, VT.

Ms. ANGNEY. I am Alice Angney. I am a member of the Vermont State Developmental Disabilities Planning Advisory Council; a special education consultant for the Washington Central Supervisory School District, but, most importantly, at least this morning, I am the mother of four children and our youngest daughter has Down's Syndrome. We have maintained her in our home by searching in many different areas of the community for the needed services, such as a preschool experience and speech therapy.

This bill appears to be a mandate to make available a continuum of services within the community for all children, including the handicapped. I see it as supporting the family and providing the pieces necessary to maintain individuals in the more normal environment.

The barriers to home and community living for the disadvantaged including the handicapped, are more from a lack of support pieces necessary to maintain the individual children than from an attitudinal discrimination here in Vermont. This bill appears to have the potential to put in place the necessary support pieces, including in-home services.

In Vermont the impact of ruralness, on the disadvantaged population is magnified by our mountainous topography and the lack of public transportation systems. Any program of direct services for the 0–6 age group, in fact for any age group, must have as a primary component a transportation plan. If transportation is not planned for and provided, the people most in need of the services offered are frequently unable to take advantage of them.

Funding formulas which rely in part on total population figures work to the disadvantage of the rural population. As we all know, administrative and program costs do not decrease in direct proportion to a decrease in those being served. The most cost effective program in terms of per child cost is not possible in rural areas. The low population density in most areas of the State translates into areas of low incidents of handicapped and disadvantaged in any particular area and thus the cost of specialized services are pushed upward. I would urge that the formula be looked at.

I would like to see in the section on payment a provision for the Secretary to pay an amount equal to 100 percent of the cost of providing child and family services for handicapped children, as it does for Indians and migrant workers.

For implementation of a program as outlined in S. 626 in Vermont, we would need a public information program to assure that all parents are aware of these services being available in their community. Important key types of professionals such as public health nurses, mental health professionals and doctors should be made very aware so that these services are available so that they could be used to advise parents of the availability of community services.

I am concerned that the coordination of this program with other existing State and local programs be maximum. I would want to see in Vermont the education department, specifically the special education and early education division, utilized in educational planning of all programs.

Section 102(b)(I) speaks to special activities designed to identify and enumerate identified physical, mental, and emotional handicaps and special learning disabilities as an incorporated part of programs conducted under this title. I feel this is the heart of this program if it will supply educational services to the handicapped and disadvantaged population at the age of 0 to 6, the age that all conclusive studies indicate is the most important and effective age for education.

The bill very wisely, I feel, has provisions for expenditure of funds for education and training of professionals and paraprofessionals, including parents and volunteers. Within Vermont there are several strategies available to implement this section. One possible approach could be to use the University of Vermont special education adjunct faculty, which is already in place in a large number of our school districts across the State, to offer college credit courses for this personnel.

As a parent, I support the concept of family living and the provision of the support services necessary to maintain it. Clearly, Senate bill S. 626 is needed to allow these support pieces to come into place in our State. Thank you.

Senator **STAFFORD**. Thank you very much for a very thoughtful and helpful statement.

Mrs. Stambler.

STATEMENT OF KAY STAMBLER, PARENT OF A HANDICAPPED CHILD, BURLINGTON, VT.

Mrs. **STAMBLER**. Senator Stafford, members of the subcommittee staff, the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 is a most welcome and needed piece of legislation, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify in its support.

It is somewhat ironic that after having lived in Washington, D.C., for 26 years, spending 2 years in Peace Corps Liberia, and working for Senator Proxmire for 3 years in Washington, and living in Minnesota for 3 years, I find myself testifying for rural Vermont for the Child and Family Services Act. Yet it is because of my nonrural background that I can fully appreciate the great need here in Vermont for this act.

My special interest is in what this act can do for the retarded and other handicapped children living in rural areas. It is vital that these children begin their education by the age of 2 or 3. Special classes for the handicapped are not only lacking in a rural State like Vermont, they are sometimes not the best choice for the handicapped child. Many handicapped children can do very well in a normal day care center. I know from personal experience.

Our daughter, Marni, is now 4½ years old. When Marni was 3 months old we were told that Marni was severely retarded. Since that moment we have spent considerable energy finding the best educational system for Marni and then, with perseverance, and much luck, we were able to enter Marni at the age of 2, in the University of Vermont Day Care Center.

Marni was born in Minneapolis, Minn., and had we stayed there she would have gone to Fraser School, one of the best schools for the retarded in the country. So you can imagine our concern to find ourselves moving to Burlington, Vt., a very rural community when compared to Minneapolis. And Burlington, with 40,000 people, is the largest town in Vermont.

The staff at Fraser School had told us that a retarded child must begin school by the age of 2 or 3 at the latest. Their experience with retarded children who were given every educational advantage money can buy, but who began their education at the age of 5, had been that no matter what the educators did, the children would not make the same fine progress as children of similar intelligence who began their education at 2 or 3. These years for a retarded child are so very important that if we ignore them we have crossed off much of their future. In my opinion, it is as criminal not to begin the education of retarded children at the age of 2 or 3 as it is to refuse a "normal" child an education until the age of 8 or 9, the fourth grade level. The need for early education for the retarded cannot be overstressed.

When we moved to Vermont we looked for a school that would take Marni at the age of 2. We are completely at sea. We were told that the best there would be for Marni, in Vermont, was to wait until age 4 and then she could go to school for 2 hours a day in an early education program for special education children. When I heard this I was scared for Marni and for me.

I love Marni with all my heart, and it is because of this love that I am far from the best educator for Marni, just as I am not the best teacher for my "normal" children. Marni desperately needed a school system; other adults to teach her, children to play with and as much stimulation as possible.

The experts had told me there was nothing for Marni, and then through no system at all, but pure luck, I noticed that the day care center down the street had a retarded child. I first saw Lisa, a Down's Syndrome child, out in the playground with the other 2- and 3-year-olds. Lisa was quietly playing with a truck when a boy came over, snatched the truck away and romped off to play with it. My heart said, "Oh, that poor child." Then I watched as Lisa calmly got up, walked over to the sand pile, took a handful of sand, walked up behind the boy and dumped it on his head. And I said, "If Marni can only learn that."

The next day I inquired at this University of Vermont Day Care Center and happened to talk to their full time speech therapist. I was told that Marni would not be an obstacle there; Marni would be a challenge.

Marni entered day care crawling on her belly, spending most of her time lying on her back and looking at her hands and uttering some sounds. She brought with her some good basic tools to be worked with: a love of people, self-confidence, courage, spunk and determination.

On Marni's first day I asked her teacher, "Can Marni have a bottle in school? She has never drunk from a glass." "Marni doesn't feed herself very well. Will someone help her?" I received a smile, meant for all first day mothers, and someone said "Don't worry, she'll learn." Later I was told that on that first day Marni turned over her plate for the first and last time. The other children let her know that was not acceptable behavior at their table.

Children love to be teachers, and like all other children, Marni learns well from her peers. The teachers tried to teach Marni to crawl, but soon found out that Marni could learn better from someone her own size. And the children taught Marni to drink from a glass, too. Many of the children learned that whenever they saw Marni lying on her back looking at her fingers they were to pull her up to a sitting position and get her interested in something. This peer teaching is good for all the children, and it will carry over into the years after day care.

In fact there is a 7-year-old girl in our new neighborhood who went to school with Marni 2 years ago and whenever Gretchen comes over to play with our 6-year-old boy, she takes time to include Marni in the game. The children will decide to play airport and Gretchen will say, "Marni, you be the stewardess. You pass out the food." Then she will show Marni how to play her part.

I mention this to underline the enormous benefits in putting a retarded child in day care with "normal" children. Marni has benefited, of course, but almost as important, 89 other children now at Marni's school, and hundreds of others over the past 2½ years, now know what retarded really means and how to accept and assist those who are "different."

Up to this point I have not mentioned Marni's progress and before I do, I must mention the special education people who made a large part of it possible. The special educator, who put the whole world within Marni's grasp, is Barbara Stevens, the full time speech therapist for the day care center. I wanted Marni to talk; Barbara taught Marni to listen. Barbara told me, "You have to be able to listen before you can talk." And bit by bit the English language, which had once been only a bunch of sounds, began to make sense to Marni. Speech therapy is vital for Marni, and it is also vital to begin speech therapy early for "normal" children with speech problems.

As Marni has mild cerebral palsy, the school consulted a physical therapist 3 or 4 times and was given a list of muscle building exercises. These were of great help. However, we were also given some wrong advice on Marni's physical development, and if Marni had not been in school with other objective people, I don't know if I would have found the courage, all by myself, to go against these experts' prescriptions for Marni.

Today Marni walks by herself (even jumps a bit), is developing a vocabulary, reads pictures and a few letters, and has become an active participant both at home and in her class. Although my husband and I do not believe in IQ tests, I feel I must mention that Marni's measurable IQ has gone up 10 points from the fall of 1973 to the fall of 1974.

We also feel that Marni has made greater progress in day care than she would have if she'd been only with retarded children. You know the reasons for this, I am sure: Marni models herself after "normal" children and so is learning to be "normal." And Marni, like all other children, tries to live up to our expectations of her. Naturally, expectations are higher in a "normal" classroom setting.

My strong support for your legislation has been growing over the years. I am concerned and frightened for all the other handicapped children.

Last fall I was on a panel with a mother of a mildly autistic child. The mother was thrilled because at the age of 7 they had finally found a good school for her child. I was filled with anger when I heard this: age 7—think of all the years lost. I was angry because the service people in Vermont had nothing better, nothing sooner, that they could offer this child. Age 7. It angers me even now.

Unfortunately, Marni's educational experience is the exception. Most parents of the handicapped don't know of the great need to start their children's education early. And if the parent doesn't get out and look, and even if he looks and there isn't the special services support for the day care center, another child will go on to become a ward of the State, living in an institution for the rest of his or her life.

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you, Mrs. Stambler, for a very moving statement which this subcommittee appreciates a great deal. Let me ask each of you one question, and that is this. What do you think your role as a parent should be in the operation and policymaking for the child care program?

Mrs. STAMBLER. I see my role as perhaps an adviser. I found out that I have quite a bit of expertise in dealing with handicapped children now from personal experience.

Senator STAFFORD. I thank you both very much. We appreciate your coming here, your advice and counsel. We will consider it very carefully when we write our final version of this bill. Thank you very much. The next panel scheduled for this morning, a parents panel. I will read the names and those who are here will please come forward: Suzanne Hathaway, Gail Towle, Patricia Walker, Irene Bussino, and Helen Brink. If I have omitted anybody who expected to be on this panel, please come forward also. Welcome to all of you from the subcommittee. We appreciate your taking the time and trouble to help us. As we customarily do, we will invite the members of the panel to proceed in whatever order of precedence you wish. If you have written statements, and they are not too long, read from them, if you care to, or summarize them as you might wish and we will have the full statements put into the record, whichever way you prefer. We invite you to proceed.

Parents Panel

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA WALKER, DAY CARE PARENT, ST. ALBANS, VT.

Mrs. WALKER. I am Patricia Walker. I am a day care parent, former Head Start parent from St. Albans. I am also a single parent raising five children of which yesterday there was a lot of discussion on welfare parents. Well, I feel that sometimes there are reasons why parents cannot get along together and there is no sense in putting their children through this harassment, so I have found that day care has helped me a lot with my children. I have had four of them in day care, and one was not. I have a lot of things written down here.

I am not good at reading what I write, and nobody else can read it either too well.

To my way of feeling, it would be a waste of money to try and retrain teachers who have gone through a college education to be into a certain age group for these older children of which, most generally, a parent or someone who has already taken an interest to go into this could use this training money more for their advantage of building them up. Teachers, most generally, when they come out of these classrooms are of the type that they feel that they are giving certain authorities to different people and everything all along the way, and they have had a much stronger child to deal with, so they have had to deal very strongly with children. Even myself, as a single parent, notice the difference as to how I have to handle my 12-year-old as compared to my 5-year-old. I think that we should remember—I was here yesterday and watched the movie on child care. Now, I am just wondering how many teachers would be able to come out of the teaching system and go through watching children doing some of the things that the children did in that movie, certain play acting of throwing stuff around and still being able to calmly take care of them. I have noticed that my 6-year-old—he is seven now because he just had his birthday—he came out of day care—he had been there for 3 years—I have noticed where instead of going upward, to me, he has dropped in this 1 year of schooling. So, I feel that day care is a very important part, and I do not think that a teacher could come out of the teaching system and do this. We, as parents, don't like to hear of anyone else hitting our children. At least, I do not. I am one who will go full force against someone hitting them. I feel that if we have more of these children, that is our right to take these reprimands against them. There are other ways that other people can punish your child without hitting or doing any kind of corporal punishment. They will injure this child, maybe mentally more than physically because a lot of times a person hitting a child, they will remember that a lot longer than they will the fact that they have just been told what to do or what not to do.

The years before my child became 3 years old I worked in the day care center with him, and that was when my children were in Head Start. I know that there are a lot of things that go on there. Unless you go into a center, you really do not realize what goes on in these centers. A lot of people figure that a mother dumps her child at this door, and figures, "I am going to have 4 or 5 free hours to myself." This child, while there, is learning a lot of activities that we would not dare to teach our own child. I have always been scared of heights, so most of my children are frightened of heights, but they learned to climb things and do things like this that they would never have learned before in their life.

One of the problems that we do have is transporting some of these children that I know could very much use this. Some of them have been refused because of the fact that maybe their parents make a little bit too much money or something. When you are going through the screening of these parents, you have to go by gross income. This parent may be $10 or $15 over. There might have been medical bills that amounted to hundreds of dollars that could have put that parent back into that category where their child could be accepted. I think that that is something that could be pushed into here somehow so that some of these other parents could get their children in.

I know we have our 10 percent of handicapped children of which we most generally always get a lot more than that, because there are other handicaps besides just that you can't walk straight or something else. There is speech and everything. There are a lot of things that you have to look for when you are going through these screenings. I figure that our duties, as parents, are to learn the ways to work and play with our children; also the educational way of doing this, not just physically playing with them. I mean playing with them so that they learn something from it, and also, to let them learn to do things like working in the kitchen. One child we had went into the kitchen and learned to peel carrots of which that child found it very exciting to think that he had learned to peel that carrot, of which at home I would not have allowed him to do that.

I think that this money should be used to allow more centers to be put up in this area rather than all into training. I noticed that in your bill, as far as I went, because I couldn't go through all of it, there are millions of dollars there that I think could be used to train more people to work with these children and build more centers. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. If I understood you, you set forth a theme that has recurred in many witnesses' statements, and that is that transportation is a problem in the day care centers and all of the programs for children in ages 0 to 6 years.

Mrs. WALKER. It is very much.

Senator STAFFORD. I got the strong implication that you feel that a teacher whose education is a product of our educational system which produces a teacher for the school system needs further special training to cope with the problems of day care centers, et cetera. Am I correct in that?

Mrs. WALKER. Yes, but I feel that we have teachers that we have already trained through money which has already been funneled down to us. They should be considered, I think, first because they have already been trained in this. In new centers, I think, if you are going to take these teachers, you should be thinking very much of training them because there is going to be a lot of training that will be different.

Senator STAFFORD. I think that is the key of what I was looking for. It is a different environment for teaching and requires a special experience in education. Thank you very much.

Mrs .WALKER. The same as it is for work as it is when you are at home with your children. There is a different environment and a different education you have to have.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. We appreciate the statement. We invite the next member of the panel to proceed.

STATEMENT OF GAILE TOWLE, PARENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, REPRESENTING THE NORTHEAST KINGDOM HEAD START POLICY COUNCIL

Ms. TOWLE. I am Gail Towle and I represent the Northeast Kingdom Head Start Policy Council. I am on the personnel committee. I am the mother of eight, also divorced. I am on welfare. I have children ranging in different ages 19 to 4. I have worked in Head Start before. I have worked as an aide through operation mainstream when it first started. I would like to suggest some different things, things that I would like to see changed, or maybe thought about at least.

I would like to suggest improving on getting parents into centers. Social Service Aides need more training on how to get parents who are not participating in group activities involved. Aides need to be able to spend more time with certain parents that they are not able to spend this time with them now. Possibly by taking them off the task of transportation to and from the centers or by increasing their paid hours, they could do this aide work better. When I was an aide in mainstream, doing the same type of work, I worked and got 24 paid hours. Actually, I worked about 45 hours a week. This is why I did not put in an application for the job opening in Gilman.

Sometimes it is forgotten that parents are teachers. Parents work with their children every day. If they are having problems, the children are affected. Even if the problems are not understood by the children, the children sense the tension. Child care and nutrition are natural things to teach parents in a center, but what about problem-solving techniques, improving self-image, and communication skills?

Some homes are so bogged down that the parents are not sure exactly what their needs are. While doing this report, I was working with one of my friends who also has a child in the same Head Start Center. As we were doing the outline, my words were being turned into her needs and their solutions. I sensed her thirst for knowledge in these areas. You need more than a thirst for knowledge; you need transportation. I have tried to participate in projects and had no car to get there. I had to get up and leave on the schoolbus with my children and baby at 7:30 in the morning, going to the next town which is about 9 miles away. Then I would have to bum a ride to get to the next town where my class was, which was 10 or 12 miles away. On the way home, I had to bum a ride back and ride the schoolbus back home with my children at night. Still when I got there, I had problems with a wood furnace, the problems that the eight children were bringing home, transportation, and things like this. I soon dropped out of the program because I could not keep up with the 4 extra hours I had to put in each day for transportation, more than the other participants did.

More transportation problems come about when one parent or another is kept from using a family car to further their education because the other parent isn't able to accept progress by the other. Rural areas like ours pose a real problem for aides and transportation. It is not like when I grew up in the city where if you wanted to go someplace, you just hopped on a bus and went. Around here you cannot even just hop in a car and make sure that you are going to get there because of the road conditions; you have washouts because of rain, and things like this. Things that I know from growing up in a city, that were new to me to have to tackle.

Since transportation in the rural areas is a problem, I would like to see better interstate relationships where there are centers on State boundaries in one State and not in another close by. It seems that where the centers are federally funded, if there are not enough children to fill slots in one State, they could be taken from another, as my daughter who is now in the Gilman Head Start program filled an opening that was left. She is the fourth child that I have had in the Head Start program. The others are in the summer Head Start programs. Even at this, Nancy was given a head start on problems that have taken 6 years to make much progress in.

One other thing, when people are given knowledge and a chance, children can be taught very rapidly at a real young age and the cost of undoing damage that has been done—like in my own family. It is just astounding the things that can be done when parents are helped with emotional problems. I have seven of my older children needing emotional help because of problems that we could not get help for. I also have my 4-year-old daughter and people like my mother who is, like this lady brought out, educated differently. My mother is a professor in a junior college and says that a 2-year-old child cannot understand. This is wrong. If a 2-year-old is given a chance, they can understand. I had a 2-year-old daughter that started using the phone, dialing "O" so that she could get help if she needed it because her other brothers and sisters were not there. She had to be brought up differently because my other children were together in a group. There was a mistake in communication, the message did not get through, Beth has been left at home since she went to Head Start. She is not afraid of being alone because she knew how to dial "O" and get an operator. Just some simple thing like this, she never panicked, she was there by herself for about 10 minutes, dialed "O" and said, "operator, I am a little girl and I am home alone and my mother is not here," and she put together names that the operator could use to get help. If a child is given a chance, they can learn to do these things. Right now, she is just not quite 4½ and she has memorized different numbers that she can call. She calls and talks to her little friends that go to Head Start with her also. She just memorizes the number. These children are just fantastic if they are caught at a young age and can be taught valuable things. Like I said, with other children the cost of reeducating is really great.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for your very helpful statement. We appreciate it. We will invite the next member of the panel to testify.

STATEMENT OF HELEN BRINK, PARENT OF A DAY CARE CHILD, BURLINGTON, VT.

Mrs. BRINK. Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Helen Brink. I am 30 years old, the mother of two children, one 5 years old and the other 15 months old. I am married and have been part of the work force for the past 8 years. I have learned that my role as a mother and my interest in my family is complemented by two things. One is the fact that I need to work and I enjoy my work; two, the availability of quality child care services for the older child at the University of Vermont Day Care Center.

Most child care centers in Vermont serve children age 3 to 6. Most centers do not have special services and cannot afford special services such as language enrichment, speech pathology, psychological services, nutrition services, medical and dental screening, and developmental problem solving. The center to which I have referred did have these comprehensive quality services available to all of its 90 children until the university decided to cut off its financial support. The effect of removing this prior support will hurt the program greatly but the center's parents, children, and staff are committed to the programs in philosophy of maintaining a health income mix and accepting physically and emotionally handicapped children who might otherwise be institutionalized. Since the maintenance of this philosophy in the short run costs money, the center will struggle along with a course staff with parents and other community supporters participating in cleaning and administrative functions such as the billing and payroll.

Even with the university funding, the slight base we have had upon which to work in the last 4 years, only two positons out of 18 full-time positions received any salary increases during the last 3 fiscal years. The cost of living has gone up approximately 25 percent during those years. Thus, receiving no salary increases has had a doubly negative effect on those people working for quality developmental child care. Programs like this one, and many others, are struggling to stay alive. There is no money in child care. No priorities for child care services have been formally recognized and we are all tired of working so hard for the children and families and seemingly having little effect on the people holding the pursestrings.

The State of Vermont's funding plan for subsidized child care is archaic and inflexible. The State, in its reimbursement policies for low-income families, discourages implementation or maintenance of comprehensive quality day care by reimbursing centers at the flat rate of 85 cents an hour with a ratio of 1 staff for 7 children. The center receiving State reimbursement is certainly not going to make an effort to hire additional specialized people. What school system or private school builds a budget based on projected hours of absence? Excuse me, I have to insert that that flat rate of 85 cents an hour is based on actual attendance.

Another peripheral effect of the inadequate funding problem could potentially be the encouragement of segregated centers, low-income, and State-subsidized centers and middle- and upper-income children in other centers. This possibility is something that many people have consciously turned away from during the past few years. Our family would probably be classified economically in the middle-income bracket. We searched long and hard during our older son's first 2 years to find a center that believed and practiced the income-mix philosophy. No services, other than in private homes, were available prior to the age of 2. Those children in the private homes that we saw were of similar socioeconomic backgrounds. At the age of 2 we did find comprehensive services in the variable income-mix philosophy at the day care center to which I have referred.

The effect of the Child and Family Services Act in the State of Vermont, and in particularly our newly incorporated day care centers, would be to recognize that community controlled comprehensive child care services are a prerequisite to a well-developed, thoughtful society.

There would be encouragement to provide child and family services rather than discouragements.

Last, but not least, tensions on parents, children, and child care staff that go hand-in-hand with living on shoestring budgets would be alleviated. Child care and comprehensive child care services for all children and families of children who need it would finally be legitimate. To comment just a little bit on what others have said, I think a critical point in Vermont is the transportation.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mrs. Brink. What is your employment? I note that you say that you are employed.

Mrs. BRINK. Yes; I work at the University of Vermont, division of health sciences in the dean's office on financial administration.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you. The Chair will invite whichever of the two remaining panelists who cares to go next.

STATEMENT OF SUZANNE D. HATHAWAY, PARENT OF A DAY CARE CHILD, RUTLAND, VT.

Mrs. HATHAWAY. Senator Stafford, Ladies and Gentlemen. Day care is a vital part of our family life. Day care is extremely necessary for my family's well-being and bears an important role in the success of our family's earning a living.

We, in turn, as a family, must support our day care program in every possible and helpful way.

Our family consists of four healthy, active children, my husband Bob, and myself.

Bob has worked for 25 years at Howe Scale Co., in Rutland. His income is not enough to support us adequately, so I must hold a part-time job. This is why I need our day care center.

We have had private home babysitters in the past and this was totally disastrous! We met with problems of sick babysitters, so I could not go to work because I had no place to take the children. The call would come late—it is a horrible feeling, especially to me, as I am a punctual person—and to my employer—to say nothing of my nerves, when I ran up against this situation. Our day care center is there and is always open every working day.

In private homes, my children were often left sitting on the back steps with nothing to do as the sitter would not spend any time doing activities with them such as are done for children at the center.

At day care the children are taken places, they see things and the children experience all kinds of educational adventures. Our children go places and do things that we either would not have the time to take them to, nor the finances to get them to. Take the circus for example: Our center would receive passes for the children, and that is a great experience for them.

Yes, my children have sat on back steps, with angry faces and very much against my working. What does a mother do when she runs up against this? Even though you try to find the best and the cleanest babysitter with a good reputation—no—it cannot come up to the day care program and I want to strongly emphasize just how much the day care program means to our family. We went without its services for long enough and can now truly appreciate its total value.

The children at the center are happy, well fed with nourishing meals, well educated in life's experiences, especially on how to get along with others—that even as a parent staying home with my children instead of working, I could not give them as much as they receive at day care.

Love? That comes at the end of the day when we spend several hours together. We talk, we play and we do other things, too. As parents, we are pleased—our children are happy. Day care is good for the children and this will make far better citizens, I am sure!

As a family, we must support our center, help it to grow and see that it improves all the time. As a helping family this is what we do.

As a parent, I serve on the board of directors at Sugar Maple Children's Center, having missed only one meeting in 2 years. I feel honored to serve on this board. It is important to know how the center is moving along. As parents we must help to set some policies that are necessary and then to follow through to see that these were good policies and good decisions.

Last summer my oldest son, Ernest, volunteered to work all summer as a junior counselor in the 4- and 5-year-old rooms. He learned patience and he grew in many ways, and it was good and he was in that film yesterday. I feel we contributed another hand to serve the day care needs in our community.

Each afternoon I drive the center's bus to pick up school children that must attend day care until they are picked up after work by their parents. The program is good and the children seem hardly able to wait to reach the center. They are truly excited about what is awaiting them at the center. I feel driving is helpful and I enjoy doing a small part.

In closing, I cannot emphasize enough the importance of the total day care program in our family's life. I am sure there are more appreciative families and many more needy families that must receive child and family service programs of the type to be offered by your bill. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Mrs. Hathaway. Since we share the same hometown, I am glad that there are some representatives here from Vermont's second largest city, Rutland. We noted that you were in the pictures that we saw yesterday. The subcommittee will invite the remaining member of this panel, who has to be Irene Bussino, to proceed next.

STATEMENT OF IRENE BUSSINO, PARENT OF A DAY CARE CHILD, ROCKINGHAM, VT.

Mrs. BUSSINO. Thank you, Senator Stafford. I am Irene Bussino, mother of children in 5–C Inc. Homebased Parent-As-Teacher Program; Chairperson, 5–C Inc. Head Start Policy Council, Rockingham, Vt.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my views and feelings on why this project should continue and be expanded to the middle class due to the fact that a lot of times financially, due to illness, people can go from middle class down to low income to maybe welfare recipients, and these children still need the help from these programs.

I have been in the parent-as-teacher program for 2 years with 2 children in it. My feeling is that the first 6 or 7 years are very important in the development of a child. Many families do not have the means or know-how to teach their children to develop mentally, emotionally and physically. Most of my experience has been in the rural district, that is outside of town where children do not have close neighbors to associate with. So, when they start school, it is very hard for them to adjust. If they have the opportunity to be in Head Start or parent-as-teacher program, they know what to expect when they start school and can meet the challenge.

Parents and children both benefit by the program due to the fact that the parent plays a very active part in the child's development and in helping each to understand the other. He or she (the child) knows that the parent cares and a child who feels wanted and loved is a happy child willing to learn and accept responsibility and go ahead and make a place for himself in society. These are some of the things that go on in the homebased program that teaches the parent. The teacher comes into the home and shows the parent how they can, in everyday living, teach the child to develop. For example, they bring in shapes. The teacher brings in educational equipment, then shows the parent how, by using everyday things such as boxes, cans or anything that relates to shapes.

Balance beams, shears, coloring crayons and puzzles help with the coordination of hands, feet and eyes. Books open up a new world to the child at a very young age. First, by looking at pictures, then, by parent reading and an interest in books develops that never ends.

Through the Head Start program the child has medical and dental care regularly. The parent and child learn the importance of good nutrition and a good balanced diet. These children that are being helped now are our future. They are the ones that will be responsible for the next generation. So, you see, many are being helped, but there are a lot more that need it. The Head Start program in the past and the present shows what has been done. Our future is in your hands. I hope you feel as we all do. There is a great need to continue this program. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Obviously, we feel that these programs should be continued or this subcommittee would not have come to Vermont for these hearings, With another personal note, Mrs. Bussino, we are glad that we are getting good geographic balance here, and the Chair is particularly glad since the Chair's wife came from Bellows Falls which is in the town of Rockingham. We would like to ask each of you, if you would care to, to comment briefly on this question. What do you think your role as a parent should be in the operation and policy making for the child care programs? Does anybody care to comment on that?

Mrs. HATHAWAY. I think that more parents should be aware of what is going on in the day care centers. There is a lot going on behind those doors that is good for these children that a lot of parents do not know about. They need it, but they do not know. They should find out. They should be active and try to help serve their day care centers however they can.

Mrs. WALKER. I think there should also be day care centers set up that would take care of children after school hours. Last night, the day care closes around 5 and it was closer to 6:30 or so when I got home, I found my children sitting in my home which very much upset me with five children sitting there, which I did not expect. I had a babysitter who was supposed to take care of them after school. I do not feel that the State of Vermont is in any position right now to take care of this problem of handling children because, to me, right now they have proven to me that they cannot take care of their babysitting for afterschool children, which are older children. How will they do it with our younger ones? I feel that in the centers, as parents, we should be on either the boards, the committees, the screening, anything that we can be into that does not interfere with our jobs. Because like screening committees, your board committees and these things are done on a nightly basis so that gives your working parent a chance to get in there and find out what is going on in your centers.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you. Anyone else care to comment?

Mrs. BUSSINO. Just one thing, it should be made known to the public what good has been coming from this. The general public does not know what good these programs are.

Senator STAFFORD. That is a good point.

Mrs. TOWLE. Like I said, I think more attention should be paid to the parents who are not participating all the time. If I had the time, I would be in the center everyday. I love discovering with the children and helping them learn new things. I felt like thanking a mother who had a child in there who was 5 years old and had never played in sand and water. I was working with another child who does not speak and was trying to get him to copy things that I was doing in an effort to get him to use his tongue in therapy. We had started with other small things and another boy just came along and said, "what are you doing?" I said, "haven't you ever played with sand and water?" He said "no." He is 5 and he comes from the country even, but this boy likes to study about things in the sky and things like this, and he evidently has never come across this. I think other parents should come more into the center and learn this. This child sat there with a great big pail of sand pouring water, like just feeling of it, like for 20 minutes, he just never let it go. Some marvelous things like this, parents don't know. A lot of them don't know that a child needs to do something like this.

Mrs. BRINK. If you have community controlled child care centers, I think the parents' role will be extensive. If they are not community controlled, I think the parents' role will be decreasing.

Senator STAFFORD. The subcommittee thanks you all for taking the time and trouble to be here. We can assure that what you have told us will be considered, not only by this Senator, but by the other members of this subcommittee and the full committee as we are working on a final version of S. 626. We have now reached the point that the Chair noted at the beginning of the hearing this morning that a new panel which requested to be heard yesterday would be inserted at this point. The panel consists of Rebecca Merriam, Starr Bettis, Delores LeBarge, Roger LeBlanc, Jeannette Randolph, Virginia Miller, and Brad Densmore. Will any or all those people who care to come forward to the witness table. The Chair is aware that there is more than one side to these questions. There is an old saying in Vermont and New England, "It is a mighty thin pancake that does not have two sides," and we want to hear whatever you care to say in connection with this legislation and the general field as much as the testimony of anybody who appears here. So, if you will identify yourselves as you talk, we are ready to listen to whatever statements you wish to make. In addition to whatever you say here, if you wish to submit written statements for the record that can be sent to us within the next 2 weeks, we will be glad to receive those as well, so with that, we'll be glad to hear from you.

Panel in Opposition to S. 626

STATEMENT OF REBECCA MERRIAM, MORRISVILLE, VT.

Mrs. MERRIAM. Good morning. My name is Rebecca Merriam. First, I feel that the most important point is that I am a Christian, a mother, patriot, have four children, and I am not an orator. I am not well versed as maybe some are, but I would like to share with you my heartfelt feelings on this. I was expressing some of my views yesterday to some people and one woman asked me who I was, rather rudely, and what group I represented. I said "I represent myself," She found that very hard to believe. She said "You know, that is very strange that an individual comes to represent themselves." But, I do represent myself and my children and I feel maybe there are lots of other mothers in the State that don't realize the detriment that I feel in this piece of legislation.

I have several thoughts, Mr. Stafford. First, let me state that this is a great Nation, a Christian Nation, set up on Christian principles. But, as other nations, we are subject to fall. I feel that the family unit is the very cornerstone of our Republic; we're built upon this. I believe that the Constitution was divinely inspired by the Holy Word of God. Men fought and died for this Constitution, and that insures me the right to children and all mothers to raise them.

In the Word of God we find in the Psalms that David said, "Lo, children are inheritage of the Lord and the fruit of the womb is His reward." Someone once said, "The hand that rocks the cradle, rules the nation." I think that is an excellent sentiment.

I know that some mothers have to work. I know there is a problem. I am not saying that I have all the answers. But, gentlemen, it is not the case every time. One mother yesterday on the film, I sat and viewed this film, said that she hated to be home with her child. I feel awful sad. The Bible does say that some will turn, they won't have natural affections in the last days. I feel sorry for that mother if she does not honestly want to be in her home.

However, gentlemen, please, I stay home with my children. I pay my babysitter and I don't want my tax dollar to pay their babysitter. When we have Federal money, gentlemen, I firmly believe we have a Federal hand rocking the cradle. The U.S. Government a few years ago studied the Kibbutz in Israel. This concept is very un-American to our way of life. The Bible says that women are to be in the home and that the man is to be the head. We have nothing to learn from a government who puts their children in a home at 6 weeks, they take them from their mother.

I heard a lot of testimony yesterday on the importance of early childhood training. I give testimony this morning to the fact that early childhood training is vital, but it must come from the Word of God and from the mother and the father and not from a government-oriented thinking project. In a student survey a couple of years ago

I submitted this to the Vermont Senate Committee on Child Care last year. There was a picture of a child care center in Canton, China, and it had pictures of little children in a child care center in the back of a sewing factory and they had guns in their hands. The caption under this was this—this was in the Burlington Free Press—"A survey was taken in the United States, 44 percent of the high school students believed the Government should take care of their children." The caption went on to say, "Don't be too impressed; these little children are singing we are determined to liberate America." I don't feel that America needs liberating, not what Red China considers liberation for America. It is enslavement.

Families should be together at home. You know, the thing that I find the most appalling about this piece of legislation—how can anyone possibly believe that Government providing a place for a mother to leave her child days, nights, weekends, maybe summers, can strengthen that family? How is that possible when a family is not together?

Edward Ziegler, Hughes' former head, was quoted as saying, "People don't realize the monumental nature of this legislation and what effect it can have on the country in 20 years." He added, "He was very apprehensive of this program." He said that it would set up family, instead of complementing the family, I am afraid that it will supplant the family altogether and revolutionize family attitudes. He said that he was very apprehensive adding that Russia, which had day care centers for children for decades, is now going in the other direction. This concept, gentlemen, I find appalling and very alien to the United States of America. Mr. Ziegler also said that he felt that the United States was headed toward an institutionalized direction.

I fear, too, as Mr. Ziegler, however, gentlemen, I can't promote in any way what I fear. When the State starts giving the children rights, then providing an advocate to enforce these rights over their parents which comes from a United Nations document, gentlemen, this is ungodly ground and very, very dangerous. Anti-American—it is very anti-American for the Government to babysit. Not only to babysit, but to take comprehensive care of a child. This is a mother's place and their privilege, and should never be usurped by the Government.

We heard yesterday, gentlemen, on this film that they thought the best birthday present that they could give these children, or the perfect birthday present, was child care by 1976. Gentlemen, I say that if you want to give the children rights, let's give them the right to a full-time mother instead of promoting something for a mother to be out of the home. If you really want to give them a birthday gift, I feel the gift of their mother, then, maybe we could, once again, be a Godly Nation. Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator Stafford. Thank you very much, Mrs. Merriam.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CLARENCE MILLER, PARENT, MORRISVILLE, VT.

Mrs. Miller. I am Mrs. Clarence Miller, Sr. I reside in Morrisville, Vt. I speak as a God-fearing Christian woman, a happy wife, mother, and grandmother. I represent myself, and I speak as a very concerned citizen for children who are not old enough to speak and for those who will never be allowed to speak.

In opening, let me quote remarks from the January 1974 Mensette Report. "Evelyn Reed, Spokesman for the ERA proponents says in her book, 'Problems of Women's Liberation,' that they are demanding the following fundamental changes in the woman's place in American society. First, the first change being to promote free 24-hour child care centers throughout America. These would be under Government funding, community controlled, not child care facilities operated by churches or charitable organizations as has been the custom in the past. These would be State controlled just as they are in the Soviet Union. Second, will be the demands for free abortion on demand. A child having no right to be born if the birth would interfere with this revolutionary timetable. Third demand being equal job and educational opportunities." I believe this to be, this ERA legislation, one of the deadliest laws that has ever been forced upon the American public. I pray nightly, gentlemen, that it will never pass.

To go on, to clarify some things—this is all relative too. From the early writings of Marx and Engels we read and learn that the Communist views of marriage and family are directly opposite to that of our Christian heritage. America was settled in the beginning by God-fearing men who crossed the ocean and setting foot on our shores wrote and together signed the Mayflower Compact—in the name of our God, Amen—their God being Jesus Christ.

Our Constitution was framed by the Ten Commandments as found in our Holy Bible. Patrick Henry stated in his day that even then there was an insidious campaign being waged in this country saying that we were a religious country and not a Christian one. He said, "This is a lie; religion is belief in something or anything; Christianity is the belief in the person of Jesus Christ." Now, I maintain if we are, as I believe that we are a Christian nation, one nation under God, should we not carry out to the best of our abilities His divine precepts? We should. Our leaders take oath to this effect. The Bible teaches that the family unit was God's first concern after creation. The parents were given children as a blessing of Divine favor. These children were to be nurtured by His teachings. They are His heritage, as Mrs. Merriam quoted.

Remember the words of Christ, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not." And in a humanly State controlled day care center, they are not going to get teachings of Christ.

I was brought up by God fearing stock. My mother died when I was young, 10, and my father I do not remember. I never envied children in an orphanage, but I envied children with a mother. But I thank God that I had good grandparents who saw to it that we were taught. Otherwise, I would not be sitting here today. If I had been a concept of Aldous Huxley's brave new world and conditioned, I would not be speaking out as I am.

I read the following from bill H.R. 2966, "* * * that the Federal Government intends to increase the funding of this so-called child and family service bill." I would like to stop here. Here again, is a misnomer, "family-child," is not the child part of the family unit? "* * * family-child service bill from millions to billions during the next few years." I read in the papers that our population rate is steadily decreasing. I believe I read the other day that 5 year olds now are down 1½ million, and several schools who were supporting four rooms per grade are now letting teachers go; there is only three rooms per grade. I read that our population rate is steadily decreasing. I believe that I recently read that we are at the lower level of the year 1937.

Millions of babies have been murdered here in our country. Sterilization clinics are busy as husbands and wives are being lectured to by family planning centers. And note this, please, most seriously, the fruit of their labors are ending up in Federal funded mental health labs. I know something of what is happening around in our area. One has only to sit in front of the mental health building. I called the school board, I think it was 3 or 4 years ago, and asked how many parents had been through mental health in 6 weeks' time, and at that time I think there had been 79 from our small town. I mean, this is gross, gentlemen. I don't see how any parent would subject their child to this anyway. I really don't. I believe that the planning, the future planning, of this whole mess is to screen every parent, every child, for the third world, where the United States will be one state in the world government headed by a world leader who will have to take the mark and die in His blood. This is all in the Bible.

Sensitivity training sessions are federally funded in Washington. Senator Sam Ervin is very concerned about this, and he is doing what he can to prevent it. People are being conditioned. I wrote to the National Training Laboratory, I get their calendars. They are a movement to change the thinking habits and ways of the Nation, a generation. Did not Lenin say, "Give me one generation of youth and I will take that country"?

I was not here yesterday, but I understand that a film was shown and you suggested adopting, or the film did, happy birthday to our children on our 200th Bicentennial, something like giving them a day care center background to celebrate the 200th year. Should we not be on our faces in the dust mourning? What has happened? The children have been murdered in this country.

I would like to close with a quote from the Holy word of God and the fourth stanza of our National Anthem. I would like to read it and then I would like to submit this paper, excerpts from a lecture by Alan McDowell, M.D., before the Arizonians for Mental Freedom. This paper is on the evils of the mental health program.

I will see that you get more information before the 2 weeks are up. I sent you and I did Mr. Mallary and our Representative last year much information. It grieves me, Senator, that this State has a Senator who is foremost in the promotion of this. There was a judge here from Pennsylvania last fall who said that they weren't getting ahead, they weren't progressing out there in Pennsylvania on this legislation because of the paperwork, so they were going to take Vermont as a task force State. Her name is Lisa someone, she spoke here last fall and I can submit some background on her. I contacted someone, another lawyer in Pennsylvania, so I have some background on her and I think other States are standing up. I hope that every American will be counted in this. Now, this is the quote that I would like to leave with you most sincerely. It is found in II Chronicles 7:14.

"If my people, which are called by my name"—we are called a Christian nation—"shall humble themselves and pray and seek my face and turn from their wicked ways, then will I hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

I would like to submit this is what we should do. This Earth is getting to be a huge graveyard. The blood of these innocents is crying out to God. And one day, gentlemen, you seem to be in the majority, and I am sure you are, but one day you will stand alone in the presence of Almighty God and the books will be opened, and the accounts will be read, and you will not have an organization or a Federal Government in back of you. Take this as a warning.

"Oh thus be it ever when free men shall stand between their loved homes and the war's desolation blessed with victory and peace may the heaven rescued land praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation, when conquer we must when our cause it is just and this be our motto In God is our Trust; and the Star Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you. Who will be the next participant?

STATEMENT OF ROGER LeBLANC, FARMER, EAST HARDWICK, VT.

Mr. LEBLANC. I am Roger LeBlanc from East Hardwick, and I am a farmer. I love this country for its freedoms, but we are slowly losing our freedoms. I would like to read the last stanza of the Star Spangled Banner:

"Oh thus be it ever when freemen shall stand between their loved homes and the war's desolation blessed with victory and peace may the heaven's rescued land praise the power that hath made and preserved us a nation, then conquer we must when our cause it is just and this be our motto In God is our Trust."

The Child and Family Services Act—now, gentlemen, how can any right minded person, a citizen of the United States, take a child out of the family and separate them from the homes? A child is taught, is "learnt" more in the homes than in any school. They see how their parents act, and they more or less follow the ways of their parents.

When the child is brought in the schools through this day care center, he does not have anyone to follow. His mother is a stranger to him. The father is a stranger, and the teachers are more or less strangers also because of having no one to turn to. If a mother can't take time to teach their children the things that a child should learn at a young age, because at a young age a child learns more from 1 to 5 than he does for the rest of his life. So, I feel that a mother should know how to take care of a child, and take care of that child with love and care.

I don't feel that our country should become another China where a child when he does not know his parent could someday turn against them. Thank you for this time.

Senator STAFFORD. You are very welcome, Mr. LeBlanc. We will now hear from Miss LaBarge.

STATEMENT OF DOLORES LaBARGE, MORRISVILLE, VT.

Miss LABARGE. My name is Dolores LaBarge. I would like immediately to register my opposition to any type of legislation, such as the Child and Family Services Act, and my reasons are plain and my concerns are genuine.

I think this morning that a couple of people have made statements to the effect that Vermont is very rural and behind and backward.

But, I think Vermont, of the 50 States, is one of the most progressed in experimentation, in various things. Education is one, which is most serious, and child development another. I think that even the title of the bill, The Child and Family Services Act, presents a serious breach in the family unit. It reads Child "and" Family Services Act—already there is an "and" between the child and the family. Children are still a part of the family at this point. I would like to see it remain that way.

Next, let me point out that no legislation, no matter how well planned or protected, can be used only for good, and this is a most dangerous piece of legislation capable of being used disastrously to turn America's children into pawns of the State. Once big government gets its hands on anything, it does not let go, and that includes our children.

I see the personnel training and the facilities being prepared under this program as very long range, with huge and far-reaching goals, that being eventual and not far in the future, control of every child from cradle to grave. Much to my dismay, far too many people want this type of security, but do not realize that they will have to sacrifice their most prized possessions, their children, to get it.

Granted, children have needs which must be met. But, it is up to the parents, and not for the Federal or any other governing body to determine what the child's needs are nor how they can best be met. If State and Federal Governments would stop taking money away from our citizens to pay for their latest ideas, we would not have to worry about having enough money to pay a babysitter, a competent one, or whatever the needs might be. Some mothers probably would not have to work out. The people would be able to decide what they wanted to do with their money instead of having it taken from them and, in turn, being used to take their families and homes away from them.

Must we, as a free nation, fight to keep from being enslaved by our own Government? Aren't the foreign tyrants enough?

As for the clause in this H. 2966 which states that the act would not be construed to infringe on or usurp moral and legal rights and responsibilities, we have the example of the public schools. Parents are so unsuspecting and trusting of teachers and administrators that too few know what is really happening because they are working hard to pay for the education of their children. Once you have a wild deer eating out of your hands, you don't do anything to scare it away. And, believe me, they are not going to give progress reports to parents on how well the child's one world attitude is developing.

I would like to read a quotation from UNESCO's book "Toward World Understanding." I might add that UNESCO works for NEA, the PTA, and school systems to weaken religious faith, eradicate patriotism, and create a generation gap between children and parents, and I see this legislation as doing the same thing.

> The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. Not only can it correct many of the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership in the world's society.

That is taken from page 9, book 5, of UNESCO's educational guide toward world understanding. To further quote—

> As long as the child breathes the poison air of nationalism, education in the world mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should, therefore, use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism, patriotism.

The very people who instruct these children, if not morally straight and spiritually sound, will be imparting knowledge and behavior patterns to children which are less than desirable. I have seen a lot of Government employees, and I don't feel that they choose the cream of the crop. We have a God-given heritage and we must keep it. I realize that this is comprehensive which means all inclusive, child care legislation is being promoted by a minority, and their motives are selfish. It may appear to be a majority, but the majority of the people are not informed as to the serious consequences of this legislation. But, let me speak for a multitude in saying, let America stay blessed of God and keep the family united unto Him. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, all of you, for your statements. I am going to ask one question for your comment, if you care to. But before I do, to keep things in context here, the Chair should read the first paragraph of section 2 of S. 626 which is the bill that this committee is holding hearings on rather than the House bill that you referred to, which is quite similar to our bill, but not exactly the same bill. Section 2 of the bill before the committee, and the purpose of these hearings reads this way—

> The Congress finds that (1) the family is the primary and most fundamental influence on children; subparagraph (2), child and family service programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family, and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services with the view toward offering families the options they believe are most appropriate for their particular needs.

I just wanted the record to remind us that whatever services this bill or a successor to it might offer are services which are only available to those families which wish them. The services are designed to strengthen, not weaken, the families. Let me ask you, if you care to comment now or later in writing if you prefer to do it that way, this question. Would you support a program for helping mothers stay home, that is, for example, using Federal money to pay mothers to stay and provide thereby sufficient income to families to maintain an adequate standard of living while mothers stay home? What would be your reaction to that?

Mrs. MILLER. Are we not doing that now through welfare programs?

Senator STAFFORD. We may be in some cases.

Mrs. MILLER. I believe we are doing that. I was brought up by my uncle after my mother died and he was the county sheriff. We lived at the Lamoille County Jail, and he was also the overseer. They helped people in need. But, these people had some pride, they did not want their names on the town report and often would pay back the town. They just wanted the help over a hard time. They were self-sufficient, like my grandparents, they took lots of children in. They took needy people. The town helped one another which is being discouraged now because there is so much Federal funding. Many of the child care centers are manned by what I term "revolutionaries." Jerry Rubin wrote in his book, "another concept, right." I am well versed about this. I would like to interview about 10 of these people and the head of these child care centers to see if he is an American, if he believes in our principles, American concepts. Two more things that I want to say. Didn't Dr. Spock himself say that the child—they had an experiment in the 1950's, was it, when they took so many children and brought them up in a hospital unit and so many that were—this is in his book

I believe—and he came on national television saying that the children did far better who were taken care of by their parents. Another thing that comes to my mind is this. Are there going to be so many pressures put on the parents to go through mental health screening themselves with their children that this is going to be counted child abuse for those who will not submit? Will the pressures be so great? But I do believe that we are paying; we are working hard to pay our income taxes and other demands. We are a Republic too—I would like to remind you of that—not a Democracy. We have a limited government. Our people have always been self-sufficient. They had some national pride, and they helped one another. That is the life that I have grown up under. I am seeing another concept today.

Senator STAFFORD. Would anyone else on the panel like to comment on the specific question that I asked?

Mrs. MERRIAM. There is one thought that does come to my mind, Mr. Stafford. A few years ago our town, a little town, started to give just a little money to an organization called the Lamoille County Development Council. This was really going to help protect us from people coming in. But, Mr. Stafford, that has turned on us, that legislation. There is no more private property. The Government has its foot outside the door. I know a young man who went to a zoning meeting a couple—I know this probably seems irrelevant—but what I am saying is, legislation changes. This says it is going to protect. I tell you, sir, I don't feel protected at all. When I saw my town give money to the Lamoille County Development Council which was going to protect my land and it usurped it, it is gone! I see the same thing in this. You cannot guarantee me that; you don't know who is going to take your place. There was a young man yesterday that I spoke to, and I am dead earnest about this. The Bible says that Jesus in one warning said, as Mrs. Miller said. He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me." But then He went on, He said, "Woe to the world because of offenses for it must need be the offenses come," and He was talking about children, Mr. Stafford, "but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." I think that this is very offensive. Little children need to be home. As I stated before, you cannot guarantee me that this is not going to change and grow. We know it is going to. When you start at a $150 million and you go to $1 billion in 2½ years, that is a lot of Federal money and that is a lot of Federal control. You would have to grant me that Federal money does mean Federal foothold. I know that. We have seen it in other aspects. That is the way that I look at this, Mr. Stafford, in answer to your question. They are outside the door, and I feel that comprehensive child care will put them in, even my door.

Miss LEBARGE. I agree with what has been said and I feel, also, that this perhaps would be another way of getting Government right into the households.

Mr. LEBLANC. I agree with what has been said. I just want to state an old Vermonter's, I don't know whose, quote, "Watch out for a dead carcass."

Senator STAFFORD. We appreciate your appearing here. Before you leave, I think that we should point out that the portions of the bill that Miss LeBarge referred to, at least as they are in the Senate bill, were placed in there at the request of Senator James Buckley of New

York. They were amendments which he requested the committee to incorporate in this version of the bill, which won't be the final version. I can assure you that this Senator and the full subcommittee will carefully consider what you have said here today, both in the subcommittee when we are considering what further action we should take on this bill and if it reaches the full committee, in the full committee. We appreciate your coming here. We understand that in almost anything we try to do in America there are two sides to the question. We thank you for presenting the side in opposition to this bill. Thank you very much.

Mrs. MERRIAM. Could I say one other thing, and it may not be that deathly important. I think that a lot of people think that we can testify, I speak for myself personally, against this maybe because I am financially secure. I am, but we are a low income family. I live in a small apartment with four children, and I know what it is to sacrifice. So, if there is a mother here that thinks for a minute that I am saying this because I don't understand sacrifice, I do. I would like to leave that. We are not wealthy, but I love my children and I want to be home with them.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you for that footnote.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Stafford, Mrs. Bettis asked me to inform you that she will be writing her comments and sending them in. She has a very sick baby.

Senator STAFFORD. Would you ask her if she could get that done within the next 2 weeks so we can surely have them be a part of the record.

Mrs. MERRIAM. There is another young man who couldn't make it this morning. He had a doctor's appointment. Would there be any way he could testify in the early part of the afternoon?

Senator STAFFORD. I'm afraid that may be difficult because all of our staff and this Senator have to catch a plane back to Washington in the middle of the afternoon, but if he will send a statement to me for the subcommittee or to the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Walter Mondale, within the next 2 weeks, we will make it a part of the official record. The next panel, as we have it consists of Alicia Green, Judy Kennedy, Michele Seymour, Jeanne Alliare, and Margaret Murray. Will all or any of those panelists come forward, please. Ladies, we appreciate your presence and we see that the panel is one larger than we had officially said. We welcome the fact that you have been willing to join us today to help us with the difficulties that we have in connection with the final version of S. 626. We invite you to proceed in whatever order you may agree upon.

Parents Panel

STATEMENT OF MS. MARGARET MURRAY, PARENT OF A DAY CARE CHILD, WATERBURY, VT.

Mrs. MURRAY. It was very necessary of the Senate subcommittee to be sure that they heard all viewpoints. While I feel there was a lot of truth in some of the things in what the persons who went before us said, I feel, again, as a democratic Nation we have to insure the people have the right to choose what they want. I would like to thank Senator Stafford and the subcommittee for the opportunity to testify.

The beginning of the bill stating the rights of a parent was necessary to erase the shadows of State control of children as a justified concern. Where the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provides financial assistance for carrying out child and family service programs, I hope the programs will not be limited to those families who have a member presently enrolled in day care, that is, a child enrolled in a center before information on prenatal care for the expectant mother is given out.

The parent or parents should be informed of the services and results of the services on a step-by-step basis. To tell a parent that an evaluation or study will be done without an explanation of the scope, depth, and possible continuity of the service is meaningless. This would be true even if the information was given in the functional language of the parent or parents. I feel that it will be necessary for the written consent to include a statement in the parent's own hand, showing a basic understanding of the service being signed for.

The criteria established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the ongoing evaluations should be used as a base or beginning level to guarantee a minimal range of services to all areas. When drawing up Federal standards for child care, for the most effective use of funds in Vermont as in some other rural areas, it must be remembered that less than 1 percent of the population in this State are racial minorities. Vermont has lost Federal funds in the past because of this. In order to supplement the program in Vermont, why cannot fees collected for services be used to match the Federal share? Again, this is an instance where Vermont has lost Federal funds because of an inability to expend State funds to match.

Throughout the bill, it calls for not less than half of the members to be recipients of federally assisted day care. Such regulations, I really feel, continue the image of day care as a welfare program. Our society is one that places a dollar value on everything. Does it follow logic that a parent earning $8,500 a year makes a good parent? $12,000 a year, a better parent? Over $15,000 a year, a great parent? Do only poor—that is, economically disadvantaged—children need day care? As a parent who is on the rather sharp edge of making enough to pay taxes and survive, but barely able to afford day care, I know of children and families who need day care.

The bill asks for children to be from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. The present fee scale is not a sliding scale; it is a perpendicular scale. There are over 1,200 Vermont families with children in day care facilities. Only seven of these families pay 90 percent of the cost of their day care. The sliding fee schedule as much as anything else prohibits a parent or parents who make more than a bare subsistence salary from enrolling their children. This serves to strengthen the idea of day care as havens for poor, neglected children. The wording "working mother" does the same thing. This term refers to mothers gainfully employed outside the home. Anyone who is a parent realizes that the term "working" refers to all. This is, again, another reinforcement of only neglected children needing day care. In order for programs to be effective in Vermont or anywhere else, we must see that an appropriate and flexible fee schedule is drawn up. To have a parent or parents turn to a private babysitter because of a prohibitive schedule is unfair.

When we speak of price, I am sure that the gentlemen sponsoring this bill have looked at the price of failure. I am happy to see a bill which is attempting to look at child care as it is. It is needed as an educational facility serving children, parents, and society as a whole. Thank you very much.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much for a very helpful statement.

STATEMENT OF ALICIA M. GREEN, PARENT OF A CHILD IN DAY CARE, RUTLAND, VT.

Mrs. **Green**. I would like to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present my views on day care. My name is Alicia Green. I kind of have a twofold interest in day care in that I met my husband at a day care center, and he works there and does not earn very much money and this is one of the reasons that I want this legislation passed.

Usually, when I mention day care to someone I find pretty varied reactions, but on the whole they don't really know very much about it. When Sugar Maple Center first opened its doors to the Rutland area children, I did not know much about them either. I read bits and pieces about them in the paper. But, I decided that if Sugar Maple got off the ground, and there were doubts about it, that it would certainly be a godsend to me. In August of 1971 I was a divorcee with the responsibility of raising a child alone, a not very overly joyous prospect at the time, especially when I was living on less than $250 a month. With an ANFC grant and a job that paid me a total bring home pay of $40 a week, I was not excited about the life that I knew was in store for me—an existence, not a life, to be exact. Pay your rent, your monthly expenses and try to reimburse a few creditors that I had from a total allowance of $230 after you pay $80 or more to a babysiter, leaves very little left over to live on. I certainly don't mind working for a living. But, when I have to pay out half of my weekly salary to a babysitter, so that I can make $20 for myself, it is pretty depressing. Even if I quit my job and stayed home with what an ANFC grant allotted me, it would not offer much more of an existence.

Another big concern of mine was good care for my daughter. I wanted to be sure that Jennifer was treated fairly, supervised properly and fed a decent meal. And most importantly, next to good care, was to have someone who would not call and say, "I'm sorry, but I cannot watch Jennifer today." Consistency for me and Jennifer during my first years alone was very important and Sugar Maple certainly provided for all my concerns. In a place like Sugar Maple you can be sure to find peace of mind that your child is well taken care of and not just there for the day. They take an active interest in your child, not just to keep him around for the day, but to provide for his intellectual as well as his physical well being. It is really difficult to explain the so many things that Sugar Maple offers, the things that every day care center should offer. A child needs love and care, and not just when he gets home at 5 o'clock for a few hours, but all day long.

The children who make up the majority of Sugar Maple children come from homes where the parents are divorced. To work with these children is an experience. To see what a broken home can do to a child emotionally, they are antagonistic, bold and ready to bite the world in half, if given a chance. The staff should be, and is, trained in how to deal with children who have no reason to trust you and no reason to participate in any activity you offer. Sugar Maple helps the parents to understand their children's problems with counseling, conferences with teachers, and referrals to other agencies such as Rutland Mental Health if needed. It provides the parents with someone to talk to about their child who really knows the things that can help and offer some reassurances that your child is not the worst on the block.

The education that Sugar Maple offers a child is invaluable. Children come there with no idea of how to play with others, to cut with scissors, to sit in a group and listen to a story, and the list goes on. In day care they are taught with infinite patience to give a little, to sit for a while, clean up after a messy affair with the paint brush or putting away toys that they took out. At home it may be unusual for your child to put away his toys—I know it is for Jennifer—and at day care you often hear, "you took it out, you put it back." It is not the teacher saying it, it is the other children. The way the children learn to socialize and to relate to a group of people their own age is not an instant occurrence. It takes time but after a while you find that he can take off his own coat and hang it up without a lot of scolding to do so in the morning.

Instead of crying in the morning not to go to the day care center, he runs happily into the front door. He has learned to sit through a whole story instead of wandering away or fidgeting. It is so important to learn early in life that in order to get along you have to be able to bend and give a little. Sugar Maple provides a perfect atmosphere for this. This is not a plug for Sugar Maple, it is just that is where my daughter happens to go. Not only indoor activities but also an endless stream of outdoor activity takes place every year—a trip to the fish hatchery, picnic at a lake, a tour of an ice cream factory, a trip to a farm, and that list goes on. The day care center makes the child aware of his world. It is so vast and there is so much to see and so much to learn about. I also envy my husband because he works in this atmosphere, and I have to work at a hospital.

It is important to point out that Sugar Maple is not here just to provide fun for your child. They are constantly evaluating your child. Is he happy? Does he have any problems today that we can help with? Periodic hearing tests are given to catch problems early if possible. Physicals are required each year for the protection of your child as well as others. Sugar Maple provides relief from the worry of "how do I get Johnny to school, I have to be to work at 6:30 in the morning." They have a bus to take everyone to school on time. Even kindergartners are deposited at the school door for a morning or afternoon class; and promptly at 3 o'clock the bus is back to take them to day care for a snack and rest and then some organized activity.

Admitted that Sugar Maple is not the solver of all problems faced by a family that works, but they can relieve a lot of them. Proper care and supervision is so important, especially to a parent who feels guilty about leaving a child at the center in the first place. I would like to make a little note that I felt very guilty about leaving my daughter at day care. I am a parent who works, but I would love to stay home. Unfortunately that is not possible. Sugar Maple has provided counseling services for me and for groups of parents specifically on this and on how to communicate with your child and, you know, the guilt feelings that parents can have which are very real and should be brought out. When both parents have to work to make a decent living, it is nice to know that there is a place available that is not going to take away all of the income from you and make it not worth working for.

It is really hard to organize my thoughts as to why I think day care is important. If I was given an outline of questions to answer, I could, but to write it down is a different matter. Day care provides a happy atmosphere, a learning atmosphere, and a relaxed one. As important as it is for attending schools, is for a child to have a happy learning experience to begin with. To be put directly into school at the age of 5 in kindergarten, with no preparation about anything, is very tough on anyone. Sugar Maple or any day care center can ease the transition from a one-child situation at home to a group situation. To sum up all the thoughts that I have tried to convey, I would like to say I think that all children, Sugar Maple happens to take 2½-year-olds, from 2½ years on should be exposed to a schoollike situations or group situations before they have to go to school. It would save so much time in the classrooms if the child is already capable of handling a group situation. I think if most people thought about it, I was very shocked to find out that a 4-year-old could not pick up a pair of scissors and cut with them; you have to learn to do it. You have to learn to draw. You have to learn all these things. I figured, you know, my kid knows all this stuff, and they don't; you have to teach them,

For a kindergarten teacher who has 30 children, to have to teach everyone of them to cut or to learn their letters, that is a big task. Jenny went to kindergarten and actually she was bored because she learned all of this stuff in the day care center. Since so many problems are being solved when the child is young, then why not provide a place for the child to go where he can get his head on straight before he has to face the world?

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much for that very well thought out, interesting statement, which will be helpful to this subcommittee and the full commitee. The Chair should note for the record that it is a mere coincidence that there seems to be a representative of Sugar Maple Day Care Center in each one of the panels that is appearing today.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Green follows:]

Prepared Statement of Alicia M. Green

Usually when I mention Day Care to someone I find a pretty varied reaction; but on the whole they don't really know much about it. When Sugar Maple Children's Center first opened it's doors to the Rutland area children, I didn't know much about them either. I had read bits and pieces in the paper about Sugar Maple and decided that if it got off the ground (there were doubts), it would certainly be a God send to me.

In August of 1971 I was a divorcee with the responsibility of raising a child alone; not an overly joyous prospect at the time. Especially when I was living on less than $250.00 a month. With an ANFC grant and a job that paid me a total bring home pay of $40.00 a week I was not excited about the life I knew was in store for me. An existance not a life to be exact. Pay your rent, monthly expenses and try to reimburse a few creditors from a total allowance of $230.00 after you pay $80.00 or more to a baby sitter leaves very little left over to live on. I certainly don't mind working for a living; but when I had to pay out half of my weekly salary to a babysitter so I could make $20.00 for myself its pretty depressing. Even if I quit my job and stayed home, with what ANFC would allot me, would not offer much more of an existance.

Another big concern of mine was good care for my daughter. I wanted to be sure that Jennifer was treated fairly, supervised properly and fed a decent meal. And most important next to good care was to have someone who would not call and say "Sorry I can't watch Jennifer today". Consistancey for me and Jennifer during my first years alone was very important and Sugar Maple certainly provided for all of my concerns.

In a place like Sugar Maple, you can be sure to find peace of mind that your child is well taken care of and not just there for the day. They take an active interest in your child. Not just to keep him around for the day but to provide for his intellecutal as well as physical well being. It is really difficult to explain the many things that Sugar Maple offers and I feel that every Day Care Center should offer. A child needs care and love. Not just when he gets home at five o'clock but all day long. The children who make up the majority of Sugar Maple Children come from homes where the parents are divorced. To work with these children is certainly an experience. To see what a broken home can do to a child emotionally. Antagonistic; bold; ready to bite the world in half if given a chance. The staff should be and is trained in how to deal with a child who has no reason to trust you or any reason to participate in the activities. you offer.

Sugar Maple helps the parents understand their children's problems with counseling, conferences with teachers and referrals to other agencies if needed. It provides the parent(s) with someone to talk to about their child who really know the things that can help and offer some reassurance that you child is not the worst on the block.

The education that Sugar Maple offers children is invaluable. Children come there with no idea how to play with others, cut with scissors, sit in a group to listen to a story, the list goes on. In Day Care they are taught with infinite patience to give a little, sit still for a while, clean up after a messy affair with a paint brush, or putting away the toys that they took out. At home it might be unsual for you child to put his toys away. At Day Care you often hear " you took it out and it has to go back when your done" not from the teacher but from the children. The way the children learn to socialize and relate to a group of people their own age is not an instant occurance. It takes time but after a while you will find that He can take his own coat off and hang it up with out a lot of scolding to do so. Instead of crying in the morning not to go to day care, he runs happily in the frontdoor. He has learned to sit thru a whole story instead of just wandering away or fidgeting. It is so important to learn early in life that in order to get along you have to be able to bend and give a little. Sugar Maple provided a perfect atmosphere to learn this.

Not only indoors activity but an endless stream of outside activities take place every day. A trip to the fish hatchery; a picnic at a lake, a tour of an ice cream factory; a trip to a farm, the list goes on and on. The Day Care Center makes a child aware of his world. It's so vast and there is so much around here to see and learn about.

It's important to point out that Sugar Maple is not here just to provide fun for your child. They are constantly evaluating your child. Is he happy, does he have any problems today that we can help with. Periodic hearing tests are given to catch problems early if possible. Physicals are required each year for the protection of your child as well as others.

Sugar Maple provides relief from the worry about how do I get Johnny to school. I have to be at work at 6;30 in the morning. They have a bus to take every one to school on time. Even kindergarteners are deposited at the school door for morning or afternoon classes. And promptly at 3:00 the bus is back to take them to the Day Care for Snack and rest. Then some organized activities.

Admitted Sugar Maple is not the solver of all problems faced by a family that works but they relieve a lot of them. Proper care and supervision is so important especially to a parent who feels guilty about leaving the child at a center in the first place. When both parents have to work to make a decent living, its nice to know that there is a place available that isn't going to take all of the income away from you and make it not worth working for.

It is really hard to organize thoughts as to why I think Day Care is important. If I was given an outline of question to answer I could but to write it down now thats a different matter. Day Care provides a happy atmosphere, a learning one, a relaxed one, As important as it is for attending school is for the child to have a happy learning experience to begin with. To be put directly into a school with no preparation is tough on anyone. Sugar Maple can ease the transition from one child situation to a group situation.

To sum up all the thoughts I've tried to convey I'd like to say: I think that all children from three years on should be exposed to a school like situation. It would save so much time in the class room if the child was already capable of handling a group situation. Since so many problems are able to be solved when the child is young; then why not provide a place for the child to go where he can get his head on streight before he has to face the world.??

Senator STAFFORD. We invite the next member of the panel to proceed.

STATEMENT OF MICHELE SEYMOUR, PARENT OF A CHILD IN DAY CARE, BURLINGTON, VT.

Mrs. SEYMOUR. I am Michele Seymour, and I am here today because I am a parent of a child in a day care center in rural Vermont. I also work in the center as a food service manager, or cook if you will. So, I feel that I do have a certain degree of insight into the needs and families of this area.

Over the past months we have all experienced the effects of the recession, but it has been my observation that those who have been hardest hit have been those who had little to begin with, those who are underemployed, as the phrase goes, and the ever-growing number of the unemployed. Because the farm country and small towns in Addison County do not have much to offer in the way of jobs, the recession there has become a depression to many. Fruits and vegetables in the winter time and even milk for the children have become scarcities for some families. Some with young children have been helped by the WIC program, but it appears that this too may soon be phased out.

What has all this to do with day care? Well, at a time when there is no work, when it is becoming increasingly difficult to get food on the table or to pay the rent, and when family tensions are on the rise because no one can see a way out, that is the time when the children in such a family have greater needs—not lesser ones—for love and attention, good food, and a measure of security in their lives, which is what the day care is all about. It would seem that at such a time day care benefits could be extended to a great number of children, but at the present that is not the case. There have been recent cutbacks in eligibility making it more difficult to qualify for these services. In the past an unemployed parent could receive care for her child while she looked for work. That is no longer true. In a two-parent family now both parents must be employed in order to qualify for day care. Perhaps most alarming of all to me is the new category for eligibility known as "at risk." It provides care for a child who might otherwise be hurt physically or emotionally by remaining in the home for 24 hours a day. It sounds good, but there is a catch. There is a 3-month deadline for the family to get its problems solved. If they don't, then the child has no outlet. Anyone who has stayed home to care for small children day after day know that they can be trying sometime. How do you suppose it feels to be out of work, broke, scared, depressed and to be responsible for the care of young children? Under such conditions, I believe that we will be seeing a sharp rise in child abuse, emotional difficulties, and learning problems.

Somehow it seems that when there is much discussion of day care, it is awfully easy to lose sight of what it is really all about. It is about children. All children need the care and loving of trained teachers and the chance to grow in the company of other children near them in age and ability. They need medical and dental attention, and their nutritional needs are crucial. Insufficient protein in the prescribed years will produce irreversible brain damage. (And have you looked at the price of beans lately?)

Also, several other panel members have mentioned transportation in these rural areas, this is a very basic need. It is my belief that each and every child should be eligible for preschool or day care regardless of what his parents economic or social status might be. Perhaps that is "utopian" or wishful thinking on my part, but someday I hope that those who have the power to bring about day care reforms will cease to hold up the discriminatory yardstick of eligibility standards against those who cannot meet the guidelines. The bill that is before us now is a big step in this direction and I urge its support. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. We invite the next member of the panel to proceed.

STATEMENT OF JUDY KENNEDY, PARENT, WEST CHARLESTON PARENT-CHILD CENTER, VERMONT

Mrs. KENNEDY. My name is Judy Kennedy, and I attend the West Charleston Parent-Child Center and that provides education for children 0 to 3 and it also requires that the parent be there with the child as long as the child is there.

Senator STAFFORD. We would like to invite you to also name the youngster with you since this is probably a first in front of a Senate committee anywhere.

Mrs. KENNEDY. This is Alexander, and he is 5 weeks old.

Senator STAFFORD. Probably the youngest witness ever to appear in front of a committee. He has captured the committee already.

Mrs. KENNEDY. Families that live in the rural sections of northern Vermont can greatly benefit by parent-child centers. These centers are trying to introduce families to social services in the community that they can make use of. In the parent-child center that I attend they have brought in representatives from agencies such as home health, social welfare, and mental health. If a family needs help in some social area, the staff at the center knows what agency and which person to get in touch with. In some instances, they run into problems. The agencies are understaffed and are not capable of providing the type of help needed or giving them the help fast enough. The centers also try to provide educational services to both parents and children. I have taken part in first aid, nutrition, prenatal, and gardening courses.

What the center has been able to set up is very helpful; but, again they run into problems. It seems that it is hard to coordinate these people so that they can run a course smoothly. Sometimes the people teaching a course are unable to show up when scheduled, and the course is very irregular and not as effective because families don't know when to get there to see these people. As far as I can see, this is due to the fact that the workload that these people carry is too great and they are expected to be in two places at once.

It would also help if there was a provision in the bill for transportation problems that a staff can run into in the rural areas. In the cities they are not faced with the snow and mud seasons and the harm that they can do to vehicles. Families in northern Vermont are not always able to even make it to a child center because a staff member does not want to risk ruining their vehicle. Personally, I feel that parent-child centers are invaluable to the mental and physical growth of children. Parents are able to better themselves and receive services to make things better for their children.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much. We appreciate your appearance under rather unusual circumstances. Your testimony will be very helpful to us, and we note again the problem of transportation has been highlighted by what you have said.

The next member of the panel may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JEANNE ALLAIRE, PARENT OF A CHILD IN DAY CARE, CHESTER, VT., MEMBER OF CHESTER-ANDOVER TITLE I POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mrs. **Allaire**. I believe that the title I program is one of the best programs started. I hope that the program will remain for a long time because our children need it.

Today the children are growing up too fast and we sort of lose some touch with them whether we want this to happen or not. The 5–C home-based parent-as-teacher program in particular is one of the best ways to keep mother and children together, as it should be to maintain a good healthy home life. This is where love, guidance, patience, friendship, tolerance, wisdom, approval, praise, and loyalty start from. Without this, tomorrow's children will lose out on the most important thing we are trying to teach our children: to get along in our society, to stop the hostility that they are seeing in some of our environments. Some of our children are not getting this with so many working mothers who do not have the time and energy to teach these many important values.

With the help of the 5–C program, the staff and teachers are working hard to help our communities to maintain a good healthy home life from where all this begins. I think that there should be more money for a larger staff to have more teachers and materials to help more families so anyone interested may have a chance at this program. Because today's children are our adults of tomorrow, if we teach them to get along in our society with our help and love and guidance we will have better adults tomorrow. Especially with so many different races in our country, children do not know hate. They are taught to hate. But if we teach them the right values in the home, in our schools and our society we will have a better tomorrow with love, not war.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much. We appreciate all of your testimony. We do have one question which we, in view of time constraints, ask you to answer very briefly if you care to, and only if you care to. That is, what do you think your role should be in the operation and policymaking of the child care programs envisioned in this bill?

Mrs. **Murray**. I certainly would like something to do with the makeup of the perpendicular fee scale that I mentioned.

Mrs. **Seymour**. I would just like to say very briefly that we hear a lot of talk about the breakdown of the nuclear family and I think it is true to some extent. Many of us here today are divorced and it is very difficult to be a single parent and to be responsible for children, especially small ones. I see the day care center, rather than being a disruption of family or destruction of what remains of the family as supplanting what used to be an extended family, grandparents, aunts, and uncles. I think it is better. I think the people who do work there are people who do care for children. I think the role as a mother, of all these people, is to be as involved as possible and to feel a part of the center.

Senator **Stafford**. We appreciate that answer very much.

Mrs. **Green**. I think that as a parent you can get involved—like we raised money to buy a bus. There are a lot of things that parents can do, just go to the board meetings and find out what is going on. If you have an extra day off, you know, stop in at the day care center and offer your help. Make people aware of what day care is. Not many people that I work with have much of an opinion of day care at all. Mainly because the guidelines that are set up to have children in day care indicate that you have to be a welfare—you have to earn so much money and if you earn over that, then you cannot use day care and then you have to stay home. Then you will go on welfare and then you can be eligible again.

Senator **Stafford**. I think you are saying that if the public generally knew more about the day care programs that there would be much more support for them. Is that the substance of it?

Mrs. **Green**. Right.

Senator **Stafford**. Maybe some of the opposition that we heard would be muted, to say the least, if in some cases opponents today really understood what day care centers are doing.

Mrs. **Green**. Yes; they are not trying to disrupt your family. I know children that are better off in Sugar Maple than they are in their own homes. That is an awful thing to say, but it is true.

Mrs. **Allaire**. I am on the advisory board and I understand and I think that it is important that many parents do get on this board and to know and appreciate really what a good program that it really is. People are not aware of everything that is happening here and I think that this is where some of the problems come in with other parents. They don't have any knowledge of what is taking place. They are just guessing, they don't really know what is happening.

Senator **Stafford**. Thank you very much, ladies. We appreciate your help in this matter. The next panel, as scheduled, will be another parents panel. If we mispronounce any names, we will apologize in advance, Ethel Powell, Joan Weart, Ms. Towle, Esther Harmon, and Lorrayne Mundy. If all or any of those are here, we appreciate their coming forward. If somebody is here who expected to be on this panel and has not been called, please come forward. Ladies, we welcome you here. You are at liberty to proceed in whichever order you prefer. Would you identify yourselves as you begin.

Parents Panel

STATEMENT OF ETHEL POWELL, BARTON PARENT-CHILD CENTER, BARTON, VT.

Mrs. **Powell**. I am Ethel Powell. I go to the Barton Parent-Child Center. I serve on the board; I serve on the health committee and the early childhood committee. I belong to the Barton Parent-Child Center.

Parent-child centers are designed for low income families with at least one child under the age of 36 months and requires the parent's attendance with the child. This is because this is a parent-child center and not a Head Start.

Head Start enrolls children from ages 3 to 5 years old. My problem is that there is no Head Start center for my child to graduate into and therefore there will be a gap of time between my child's attendance at the parent-child center and his enrollment in kindergarten or first grade. The children are being well educated at the center. They are exposed to educational toys which we cannot afford to buy at home. They are taken on field trips to museums, sugar houses, farms, and zoos. They are taken for nature walks. They learn independence by putting on clothes, hanging up jackets, brushing their teeth after meals and putting up toys. This helps them to learn order and cleanliness.

There is a lot of parent involvement. Parents are child developing members of committees which make policies; cook for annual meetings as well as for daily meals; sew together; have many, many courses such as woodworking, child developing, nutrition, first aid, et cetera, and group sessions dealing with how to solve daily problems. Mothers are learning to treat their children in a better manner and with more patience with the help of the staff.

The center has a good health program and finds doctors to take care of problems like hearing, eyes, speech, and what not. People are learning to make their own decisions and become leaders by being able to write what we want in our handbook, rewriting the grant and budget yearly, and by revising the bylaws when needed. We take responsibilities as chairman of the board or other officers such as vice chairman, secretary, treasurer. We serve on committees such as the personnel committee who have to hire the staff. Other committees are the early childhood committee who along with the educational supervisors choose educational toys that are safe, make up activities for the children; the parent activity committee decides what our needs are and plan many courses and other activities.

We have well trained staff. They help us get along with each other and the children by helping us with our problems and other problems with our children. They help us help other children prepare for the school system by giving them an interest in wanting to learn. We have good social and human services provided. We are transported to appointments when needed and the social service aids act as advocates for us with other agencies such as social welfare, legal aid and mental health. We also get counseling for other problems when we ask for it.

We have bad points, too. The bad points are not enough staff, not enough money for equipment, staff, fuel, et cetera, due to cost of living going up and funding remaining the same for at least several years. Age limit is 0 to 3 and there is no Head Start in several of our areas. Not enough space for both indoors and outdoors at our particular center. Transportation is a big problem, especially in the winter.

Senator Stafford, we would like to see parent-child centers get more money so our 3-year-olds can be followed through for more education until they go to kindergarten. I feel that it is harmful to them to get this start and then just be dropped for 2 years and then have nothing until they start school. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Mrs. Harmon, would you care to go next?

STATEMENT OF ESTHER HARMON, GRANDMOTHER OF A HEAD START/DAY CARE CHILD, MEMBER 5-C, BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND HEAD START POLICY COUNCIL, NORTH SPRINGFIELD, VT.

Mrs. HARMON. Two years ago I became involved in this program, as a member of the home-based Head Start parent-as-teacher program. I learned that without a program like this our children would fall far behind the world of learning and being trained.

There have been great expectations in this program and there will be greater ones if we can keep going ahead and improve the most essential elements that a child can have today. There are children of all ages now (0 to 14) attending 5-C day care, Head Start, and kindergarten in two towns and enrolled in the home-based program, which prepares a child for school. This program gives each child a fair share of life, lets them become leaders or whatever their goal. This program adjusts a child to meet with all the challenges of life. This gives a child a chance to grow up and make something of himself and become adjusted to society.

I must mention that you cannot visualize what a child can accomplish at 1½ to 3 years of age. They learn to coordinate their hands, eyes, and their whole system of learning very young. They learn to play, to associate with other children of the same age. As children go on to Head Start, the child learns his numbers, his alphabet, and can even write his name.

In this program are valuable contents for people who have low incomes and cannot afford a better chance for their child. There is dental, medical, visual and speech service for children who are in need of these. Maybe there would be no hope for them without this.

It is a wonderful program. Teachers and teacher aides to me are some of the best. Working people who have to work and have children cannot afford a full-time sitter or even part time. This program gives the parent the advantage of being able to go to work and not worry about what is happening at home. This program has really got to be enlarged. Health programs should be extended and family programs between a child and his parent. Sometimes it is very hard to understand whether the parent understands the child, or if the child understands his parent.

Also if a child at home does not have the proper nutrition this has a great disadvantage to a child's learning. The mothers of expectant children need training in this. This would abolish children being born mentally retarded. Good nutrition is a great asset to gaining healthy and happier living.

My 2 years in this program have shown me we need all the substances of this bill, to keep a happier and healthier world to let our children grow up in. This will enable all parents and their children to participate in a growing world that maybe couldn't be for some without the help of this program. Not only does a child have the advantages, but I found out by being involved, that this program not only improves a child's mentality and growth but the parents themselves, who, until they understand what this program is all about do not realize how valuable a parent is who participates, works with and helps develop not only their own children's growing-up years, but all others that are involved, too.

This program has been very valuable to me. It has helped me see the real reason for this bill to pass. Helping and working with the every-day problems that occur helped me financially for the child I have in Head Start (for dental needs, doctors), to also help me discover that there are other parents who can do a better job, make life better for those concerned and give each child a fair chance regardless of their abilities. For all the Senators making up the family and child service bill I say this is a great organization and everyone should be very thankful we have such a great staff of people all working together to make this worthwhile in years to come. Let's expand—let's give this bill all we've got.

Senator **Stafford.** Thank you very much. We appreciate the statement, Mrs. Harmon.

The next member of the panel may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOAN WEART, PARENT OF DAY CARE CHILDREN, SUGAR MAPLE DAY CARE CENTER, RUTLAND, VT.

Mrs. **Weart.** I am Joan Weart. I am a registered nurse. I work full time and I have three children going to the Sugar Maple Day Care Center in Rutland. Proper child care facilities are essential for any working mother, particularly the single parent, such as myself. The working mother usually has two choices in the type of care for her children while she is working—a private babysitter or an organized day care center.

I am sure there are many competent babysitters available, but I personally have had some unfortunate experiences with babysitters. I have had several who were unreliable, in many cases my children were poorly supervised, and in one instance, poorly nourished.

An organized day care center is an asset to any community, rural or urban. They serve to help fulfill the educational, nutritional and recreational needs of children whose mothers must work.

Unfortunately, the middle-class wage-earning mother finds herself bearing the brunt of these services. Neither the poor nor the rich have any real problem, but for the middle class it is a struggle. My income as a professional person outwardly appears quite ample, but unfortunately, child care is not my only expense. My friends have told me. that it would be easier for me to collect welfare than to try to work to support my family. I am afraid this is the attitude of far too many people.

The wage scale in Vermont is very low in comparison to the cost of living, which also must be taken into consideration. For this reason there may be more working mothers in need of child care services in this area. It is essential that child care fees be realistic in comparison to the income of the family and the cost of living in this State. Otherwise, the mother may become discouraged and may not make an effort to supplement the family income.

I have had experience with only one day care center in this area. I feel the educational, recreational, and nutritional values of this center are excellent. However, I would like to see more emphasis placed on health, especially in pre-school children. These centers could provide an excellent opportunity for lazy-eye screening, auditory testing, etc., rather than waiting for the children to enter school.

I hope this testimony will be of some assistance to your committee. Thank you.

Senator STAFFORD. This will be of considerable assistance to this committee. Since you raised a theme that came up several times in the testimony yesterday about the middle-income families, the Chair thinks that we should note again today that the language which defines an "economically disadvantaged" child in this bill probably needs clarifying. What we intended to say, in fact what we have said but maybe too technically to be understood readily, is that an "economically disadavntaged" child is the child of a family having an annual income below $9,200 this year which does reach, actually, the middle-income families, and that the $4,000 level is not the level that this definition achieves. I think we can reword it for clarification. The Chair would ask each one of you, if you care to, to very briefly comment on the same question I asked the last panel. That is, what do you think your role should be in the operation and policymaking for the child care programs contemplated under Senate S. 626? Would you care to comment?

Mrs. HARMON. What I really think should be is that the parents should have more control of this. As it is now, they don't. I mean, some of the parents don't have that much interest, but I think that it would be better if they did have it.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Anybody else care to comment?

Mrs. POWELL. At the parent-child center I serve on the board and parents do come to me, and I think that that is great that they have someone to look forward to have things changed on the board, which we are changing, some things in the grant. We have a lot of things, but some parents don't want to feel involved and I think that is bad because they consider what other people say, what they do and I think that is even worse.

Mrs. WEART. I am also very interested in what is going on at the day care centers. I would also like to be more participating in the activities as a mother, and also I would be more than willing, more than glad, to offer my services professionally since they were having difficulty in arranging for eye testing and hearing and that sort of thing.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you. I gather that you would all approve then of the fact that in section 105 of the Act that provides that each prime sponsor designated under section 104, "shall establish and maintain a child and family service council composed of not less than 10 members," and then skipping a bit, "not less than half the members of such council shall be parents of children served in the program." Does that meet with your approval? Thank you very much for taking the time and the trouble to come here from considerable distances to help us in our considerations of this bill. We appreciate it.

The next witness is Mr. John Abbott. Mr. Abbott, we welcome you here. We appreciate your taking the time and trouble to join us. The Chair, as a disciple of Calvin Coolidge, is pleased to note that your outline of testimony at least meets his criteria for brevity.

STATEMENT OF JOHN ABBOTT, PARAMEDIC, PEOPLE FREE CLINIC, INC., BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. ABBOTT. Thank you. Senator Stafford, members of the subcommittee. My name is John Abbott, and I am a senior zoology student at the University of Vermont, and I am a paramedic at the Peoples Free Clinic in Burlington. I live in Cornwall, Vt.

I would like to give you my basic understanding, and at this time it is quite basic, of the health care system for children in Burlington, and then point out some specific health problems of the low-income family's child. Burlington has an abundance of medical facilities and therefore can offer exceptional care to local residents. The system of child care is coordinated by school system, public health programs, well-child clinics and Head Start health programs. The visiting nurse association offers early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment (EPSDT) through well-child clinics.

This program, combined with Head Start health programs, offers screening and diagnosis to all children in the area at no cost or on a sliding scale basis. Children who have health problems or whose health problems are identified through this program are referred to local pediatricians, the community pediatrician or to the appropriate agency. Vision and hearing needs and incomplete immunization records are among the most commonly treated conditions.

These programs have reached into the low-income neighborhoods of Burlington, yet there are still many children in these areas who are not receiving proper medical care. I would like to define some of these health care shortages. There is a need for treatment and prevention of chronic medical problems. As a paramedic working in the low-income neighborhood, I have seen many children with recuring strep throat, earaches and ear infections, upper respiratory infections, and common colds. Many chronic conditions are linked to the child's living situation and health habits, for example, pin worms and head lice, poor diet, and incomplete immunization record. There is a need to extend existing facilities and screening procedures to all children in low-income neighborhoods.

There is a need for sensitive, unrushed care that sets an example for and educates the parent, and does not alienate or scare the child. There is a need for openmindedness to alternative forms of care and treatment. At the clinic, sometimes when the accepted treatment does not prevent a condition's recurrence, or when a patient expresses an interest in alterative treatments, we sometimes suggest herbal remedies or other kinds of alternative treatments.

I think it is appropriate to refer some of these considerations to the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. Section 107, page 32, part B, indicates the need for a skilled child careworker in the facility or project. Section 107, page 33, part 9, shows the need for employment of paraprofessional aides. Section 107 page 51, parts 3 and 4, pertain to the need for research into preventative medicine and testing of alternative methods of care and service.

In conclusion, I think the needs for preventative health care and sensitive follow-up and treatment for low-income children can be greatly met by this bill. I hope that interested parents, paraprofessionals, nurses, nurse practitioners and doctors in low-income neighborhoods will be encouraged to organize health programs, or perhaps a children's health center, that can serve as a nucleus of health care, education and treatment as well as a screening and diagnosis facility. This is how the Peoples Free Clinic works and I think it is a necessary and appreciated part of the health care system in Burlington. The need to reach and help children with chronic medical illnesses, especially those illnesses that are linked to the living situation, requires a lot of work and dedication, as well as educational skills and medical knowledge. These are the characteristics of the community volunteer and paraprofessional. In addition, parents and children who may be alienated from the formal medical structure by ignorance, by poor living situations or by rural separation, can be reached most effectively by members of their own community that they know and trust. It is this trust and volunteer spirit that must be mustered and engendered if the low-income and rural child's disadvantages are to be lifted. I hope that the committee feels these responsiblities, and I hope that I in a small way have aided the task that is before you.

Senator STAFFORD. Indeed you have. We appreciate your appearance here with us. I noticed you are listed as a paramedic. Did you get your training in the military service?

Mr. ABBOTT. No, the clinic has a training program. There is a State licensing procedure. I am not a licensed paramedic, although I hope to go through 2 years of training and receive a license.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much. We appreciate your taking time from your own busy schedule to come over here and assist the subcommittee. The next witness is Ann Raynolds. Ann, you are most welcomed here. We are very happy to hear you. We have a copy of your written statement. We will make it a part of the record at the conclusion of your testimony and will leave you free either to read it or proceed in whatever way you wish.

STATEMENT OF ANN RAYNOLDS, DIRECTOR, CONSUMER-CONTROLLED COMMUNITY CHILD CARE, INC., WINDSOR AND WINDHAM COUNTIES, STATE OF VERMONT

Ms. REYNOLDS. I could not fit my testimony in 5 minutes. First of all, though, I would like to make some comments about some of the other testimony because, frankly, I think there is very little left for me to say after listening to the parents' testimony that we have heard here today from all the centers and all the programs. I would like to comment on one thing: Don't be deceived because you have heard about such very great programs in Vermont. These are great programs, I know because I have been in many of them; however, each one of them has to rely on outside funding beyond the State reimbursement for day care in order to function, a very large amount of outside funding. That is also true with the program that I am the director of, the consumer-controlled community child care, commonly known as the 5-C program. If it were not for Head Start funding and private contributions, we could not run day care at all. UVM day care has stated their problems in the fact that UVM had provided the special expertise and outside funding. I wish the parents good luck in trying to go it alone without UVM. It is an enormous job unless you have the kind of community support that Sugar Maple has in the town support, private foundation funding, et cetera. Again, I do not know how a day care center could function in Vermont, a really quality one, on the funding provided by the State. The licensors come in and say we must have a new kitchen floor because there is a hole in it. We certainly want a new kitchen floor, but we can't figure out how, out of 85 cents an hour per child-in-attendance, that we can afford a kitchen floor, or how we can afford the vans and the transportation. I have got to repeat that bit of support for transportation funds. I heard that possibly the Federal Government was going to help the unemployment situation by helping the auto industry. If you buy any cars, would you send them up here—vans or anything?

So there are great programs in Vermont, but I just don't want you to go away with the idea that you don't need to put any more money into them because people are knocking themselves out to keep them going, both through local support and the people working in them. One of the major problems that we all face is turnover of staff. Many of your qualified people just can't continue; they burn out in the Day Care setting. I was very pleased with the testimony of the lady down this end that neither could the public school teachers survive. They simply couldn't; they wouldn't work at those salaries and many probably couldn't survive the amount of pressure that is involved.

In line with commenting on other testimony, the Parent-Child Center concept is one that we have always favored. In fact, we applied a long time ago, when I was working with Head Start in southeastern Vermont for the parent-child funding but unfortunately it was Senator Prouty's area that got it and not Senator Aiken's. The Parent-Child Center concept is very much in line with our home-based Head Start program. The parents allocated money in our Head Start program to a home-based program that you heard about this morning, the Parent-As-Teacher program for children 0 to 3 years old. We have a special dispensation from Washington in order to include 0 to 3 children in the Head Start program, we thought it ironic that the legislation read that Head Start was for all preschool children economically eligible, but that did not include 0 to 3 years old. I had to travel to Washington to make an appeal to include children from 0 to 3.

Consumer-Controlled Community Child Care is exactly that. It is consumer controlled. Over 50 percent of the board members are parents. I personally do not feel that the provisions in the bill are strong enough for parent control. Not simply parent advisory capacity, but parent control. This has worked in our program. It is one of the few, I think, truly consumer-controlled kinds of operations in existence. I say to the parents, Bed Stuy (Bedford Stuyvesant) had practically a revolution to try to get consumer control—you have it, now try to exercise the power that you have. They do, and certainly people that you have heard from today have very definitely designed and helped us form the changes in the program.

One of the major changes next year is that we are dropping one geographic area program from our Head Start program because we simply cannot afford it. We are consolidating into three towns, Windsor, Springfield, and Bellows Falls, in an effort to run quality 0 to 14 articulated programs so that no child is dropped out at any point. I heard the Parent-Child lady saying there was no place for their kids to go after that was over; that is really a tragedy. We would like to be able to serve the children and families really well in a high-quality program, whatever their needs are, rather than spreading ourselves too thin. However, that means dropping a whole area, and, of course that does not say anything for the other towns that we have never been in, in southeastern Vermont.

I guess it is time to begin the testimony. I won't bore you with too many quotes, but I think that this is a very telling one and I really would like to read it.

> How can we judge the worth of a society? On what basis can we predict how well a nation will survive and prosper? Many indexes could be used for this purpose, among them the Gross National Product, the birth rate, crime statistics, mental health data, etc. We propose yet another criterion: the concern of one generation for the next. A society which neglects its children, however well it may function in other respects, risks eventual disorganization and demise.

This is from Urie Bronfenbrenney's "Two Worlds of Childhood."

One other partial quote that I used at a great length in the testimony is from the White House Conference on Children 1971 Report to the President:

> These reports, taken together, constitute a broad commentary on America—and a deeply disturbing one. They indict the Nation for vast neglect of its children. They challenge the proposition that ours is a child-centered society. Instead, they say that the child, as far as our institutions and laws are concerned, is too often a forgotten American.

I will use that quote, "The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world," from William Ross Wallace, but in another context. If we want national security, I believe that national security means security for America's families. And this does not mean Federal control. I have worked in Federal programs almost all my working life, and the only thing that the Federal Government did for the OEO program that was bad, besides defunding them, was that they instituted the Green amendment which virtually took the control away from the people the program was designed for. Head Start has not suffered from that. I have found that we have had a great deal of latitude in changing the programs to meet the needs of a local area, a community, or the parents; and that Federal control simply has not existed. In day care, they wouldn't dare control because they are not giving us any money in the first place.

Actually, what we feel is that there needs to be a department of human ecology to deal not simply piecemeal with child and family services but to reconstruct our human environment in which children and families must exist. What would decent housing, decent jobs, decent preventative medical care, decent nutrition, decent supportive child care services, and decent recreational services do for low-income families? In my testimony, I proceed to try and answer that, for the child and family services bill is only one piece of the pie. I may be a step in the right direction, but only if it does not start off in the wrong direction.

While I believe in integrating services to all children, and I do deeply sympathize with the ridiculous fee scale for day care that exists in this State, and the almost more absurd Head Start fee scale that was finally abandoned in Head Start some time ago, I think that there must be realistic priorities. I do not want to see any low-income families cut out of the services that they now have because middle-income people are more articulate and able to press for an integration of services when the result is that then the same amount of money must be spread over a larger number of people.

I see the priorities in increasing child and family services on a continuum. At one end are support services to families with children: homebased programs, homemakers, better environments, child development centers with opportunities for education, and training and employment for the parents; prenatal medical care tied to infant home programs after birth and parenting education; before and after school and summer programs. At the other end of the continuum is the need for pediatric treatment centers, professional alternate care facilities and training for emergency and long-term foster care parents. This end of the continuum is one that is extemely serious and the other one is terribly badly underfunded. The centerbased programs, the child development programs, must be for all-day care for infants to school age anywhere anytime there is a need established for such care without demeaning or pejorative redtape. Here again there should be a realistic sliding scale schedule possibly based primarily, although not exclusively, on the mother's income. All too often I find that parents—women—stop working because they are considered to have too much money—maybe this has to be referred to the revolution in the women's movement—but they have husbands wo say, "If you can't pay for the babysitter, you are not going out to work." Well, if they want to work, in some way they should be able to work; and if they do not want to stay home with their children, I am not sure that that is the place for them to be.

We need these quality child development centers to provide all types of services for families from budget planning, to psychological counseling, as well as programs into the homes with books and equipment for early childhood training and trained neighborhood child care demonstrators; prenatal medical care tied into infant stimulation continuing well after birth. And all this on a sliding fee scale.

In addition to these program priorities of immediate necessity, I see human ecological improvement in the areas of nutrition and preventive health care, environmental housing integration, full employment under public service for social services purposes. To talk directly about the legislation. There are obviously pitfalls in any kind of Federal legislation. I don't know what the big scene is out there in Washington or all the hangups and hazards, but I know only from my 10 years' experience with Government programs—Head Start, OEO, FAP, title IV–A—that a few things must be warned against. I don't know if it is even in the power of the legislation to control it, but mostly in the administrative regulations that come after the legislation, so I sympathize with legislation that is written for one purpose and then gets corrupted by a bureaucracy that takes over afterward. Too much is often attempted to quickly and bad systems are set in motion. This can be self-defeating to the very thing that you are trying to promote, because individual demonstration programs of high quality are really better advertising for additional funding than many bad programs. So, I believe strongly that professional standards must be set and established first—I don't know where I saw that in any of the legislation. Good materials for judgment are the Head Start performance standards, FDIC day care standards, CDA—child development associate—competencies, among others. There must be other types of performance standards. It is ironic, and I always make this point, that Head Start never had any standards as far as I could figure out, until 10 years later they developed the performance standards. When we were asked to comment on the performance standards I said, I don't care what they are, I am just glad that you finally have them.

2. Bureaucratism, our national plague. Every precaution must be taken not to set up competing and conflicting bureaucracies with wheel-spinning civil service employees that somebody can never get rid of. I went on to say some other things here, maybe I had better not.

I really feel very strongly that somehow if there is a problem about protecting Head Start and therefore you have to set up a new Federal agency to handle this Child and Family Services Act, maybe somebody should look into eventually integrating them and melding them together because all I can see are more people sitting around in offices not doing very much. Nothing depresses us more than when we travel to Boston or Washington and wonder what all those people do who sit in those offices certainly making more than any of the folks back home. That brings up another question. What happened to the cost-of-living increase for Head Start? Has the Senate passed that yet?

Senator STAFFORD. It is still in committee in the Senate.

Ms. REYNOLDS. I was in Washington at one time at the OCD Building. They had a staff meeting and some of the high echelon in HEW came down and all the OCD staff were allowed to ask questions. The questions they asked pertained to *their* salary increases under the cost-of-living bonus. So, I got pretty nervous and I stood up as a guest and said, "I am getting really nervous that the cost-of-living increase is never going to get down to us by the time it gets through these offices—well, I don't know how that is protected or controlled, but I still think that you should pass it--probably even they need it.

We must protect what is good which now exists and build on it. That follows on not developing another bureaucracy to handle the whole situation. In Congressman Jeffords' questionnaire that he sent me, he asked if a new Federal agency should be set up to handle the Child and Family Services bill if it were passed or should Head Start merely be expanded. I understand the danger in expanding Head Start might be that low-income Head Start parents would lose out because it would be spread too thin. But, I think, that in the same line, any new money coming down for children's services should be used to build on what is now good, whether it is Head Start, or whether it is the day care program, and that definitely new minibureaucracies within States should not be set up. I support the speaker who mentioned the horror of the local Office of Child Development being involved in that. (There is absolutely no reason, from the testimony you have heard here today, why the Sugar Maple Day Care, the UVM Day Care, 5-C, and so forth, other Parent-As-Teachers programs, the other many good programs in the State could not be the prime sponsors for this money). To funnel it through yet another layer of administrative bureaucracy just is not the answer. We feel very, very strongly about that: That all we need in fact is more money. We need money for buildings and renovations. We need money for transportation. We need money for speech therapists and special education people such as were made possible to the UVM Day Care Center. We need special education people to help the Marni S. We can't do that very well now. We do the best we can, and we certainly will continue. There are trained people out there that could be hired. There is no need to go through this business, necessarily, of training everybody from the beginning. There is no sense in trying to invent the wheel again. We do know how to do these programs. We are running them, many of us throughout the State, and building on these programs is what is really necessary. There must be enough flexibility so that parents and the community can determine how their program will evolve and develop, whether it will be in a homebased direction, center, et cetera.

4. Serious efforts should be made to involve the departments of education and schools more deeply in before- and after-school and summer programing, as well as concern for the environment and lives of children in general. On the whole, in our area, the educational establishment appears fairly friendly to a more humanistic approach. However, they need to be far more involved and they need to communicate far better with us and we with them. It is significant that we are still divided into "us" and "them", the early childhood people and child development specialists on one side and the educators on the other. And we consider ourselves educators, too.

5. Some catch all anxieties I have in connection with the bill: Shanker's AFT move to take over child care services seems so absurd from where we sit that I can't really deal with it. However, if it is a reality, the bill should protect against it. No one except community folks should control hiring. Professional standards and criteria can be set only by early childhood educators and child development specialists.

Too, another fear is that somehow private-for-profits groups will be beneficiaries of the bill. I hope that has been scratched in the Senate version. There is no way in the world that you could ever make a profit on child care services and deliver truly good child care services. Nonprofit childhood corporations with community controlled boards should be prime sponsors. And here I should emphasize that we definitely rule out towns or State departments, as prime sponsors.

The new moves on child abuse and neglect are laudable, but pejorative in a sense because of the labeling. We need the support services to prevent child abuse and neglect. However, the labeling for these program demonstrations represents another piecemeal move that is apt to backfire on the part of the legislation.

In closing, I just would like to say that children learn what they live. The well known poem used in Head Start's parent education says essentially that, If children live with love, they will be loving; and if they live with hate, they will hate; that modeling what we wish our children to be is truly the best, perhaps the only, educational method. We must all care more for one another as a community if we would have our children grow up to care for each other, for their community, and for this Nation.

Senator STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Ann. We appreciate your being here.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Reynolds follows:]

TESTIMONY ON CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES

APRIL 19, 1975

TO: United States Subcommittee on Children and Youth

FROM: Ann Raynolds

Director, Consumer Controlled Community Child Care, Inc. (5-C,Inc.): a private non-profit child development corporation operating in Windsor and Windham Counties, State of Vermont: Head Start Grantee Agency for Southeastern Vermont

1. Day Care Enrollment (Title IVA funds):
   40 children in Windsor and Springfield ages 2-14 all-day, all-year developmental care
2. Head Start:
   a. 60 children (ages 0-3) in Locally Design Option "Parent-As-Teacher" Program, a homebased design.
   b. 60 four and five year olds in classroom developmental programs 5 days a week.
   c. Discussion Group meetings for parents of children in programs.
3. Title I, Part B:
   The Head Start model LDO "Parent-As-Teacher" homebased program for 15 children.

Education and Experience:

Cornell University B.A. M.Ed. (In June 1975, M.A. Goddard College in Psychology of Learning and Development in Early Childhood.

Studied Preschool Education in Holland 1958-59

Kindergarten Teacher, Woodstock, Vt. 1960-61

Head Start - 1965-present: Organized first community meeting in Springfield, Vt. to explore "Head Start" idea; member first Board of Directors, sponsored summer programs in 1965, 66, 67; Director-Teacher of community-funded winter "Head Start" 1966-67; Case Aide in first full-year program 1968-69; Head Teacher 1971; 5-C Inc. Program Director 1972-1973; Director 1973 to present

Other Related Work Experience:

Director, Planning and Development Southeastern Vt. Community Action Agency 1969; Region I HEW Head Start Consultant 1969-1971; CAP Agency Day Care Consultant 1971; Head Start Program Educational Consultant 1971; journalism and community organizing.

> How can we judge the worth of a society? On what basis can we predict how well a nation will survive and prosper? Many indices could be used for this purpose, among them the Gross National Product, the birth rate, crime statistics, mental health data, etc... We propose yet another criterion: the concern of one generation for the next... A society which neglects its children, however well it may function in other respects, risks eventual disorganization and demise.

A quote from Urie Bronfenbrenner's *Two World's of Childhood* (page 1)

The following quotations are from *Report to the President: White House Conference on Children* (Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office 1971)

> These reports, taken together, constitute a broad commentary on America - and a deeply disturbing one. They indict the Nation for vest neglect of its children. They challenge the proposition that ours is a child-centered society. Instead, they say that the child - as far as our institutions and laws are concerned - is too often a forgotten American.
>
> ...Our national rhetoric notwithstanding, the actual pattern of life in America today is such that children and families come last. (p. 10)
>
> In today's world, parents find themselves at the mercy of a society which imposes pressures and priorities that allow neither time nor place for meaningful activities and relations between children and adults, which downgrade the role of parents and the functions of parenthood, and which prevent the parent from doing things he wants to do as a guide, friend, and companion to his children...
>
> The frustrations are greatest for the family of poverty where the capacity for human response is crippled by hunger, cold, filth, sickness, and despair. No parent who spends his days in search of menial work, and his nights in keeping the rats away from the crib can be expected to find the time - let alone the heart - to engage in constructive activities with his children or serve as a stable source of love and discipline. The fact that some

beleaguered parents manage to do so is a tribute to them, but not to the society in which they live.

For families who can get along, the rats are gone, but the rat remains. The demands of a job, or often two jobs, that claim mealtimes, evenings, and weekends as well as days, the trips and moves

necessary to get ahead or simply hold one's own; the ever increasing time spent in commuting, evenings out, social and community obligations -- all the things one has to do to meet so-called primary responsibilities -- produce a situation in which a child often spends more time with a passive baby-sitter than a participating parent.

And even when the parent is at home, a compelling force cuts off communication and response among the family members. Although television could, if used creatively, enrich the activities of children and families, it now only undermines them. Like the sorcerer of old, the television set casts its magic spell, freezing speech and action and turning the living into silent statues so long as the enchantment lasts. The primary danger of the television screen lies not so much in the behavior it produces as the behavior it prevents - the talks, the games, the family festivities and arguments through which much of the child's learning takes place and his character is formed. Turning on the television set can turn off the process that transforms children into people.

Children need people in order to become human. The fact is fundamental because it is firmly grounded both in scientific research and in human experience. It is disturbing because the isolation of children from adults simultaneously threatens the growth of the individual and the survival of the society. The young cannot pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. It is primarily through observing, playing, and working with others older and younger than himself that a child discovers both what he can do and who he can become -- that he develops both his ability and his identity.

Let us not be confused by the present, apparent generosity of American families swamping local adoption agencies to take in the Vietnamese refugees. These are the minority Americans who would vote for the Child and Family Services bill over excess defense and roads; or the guilty Americans aware of our role in creating the frightening conditions in Vietnam today; or the sentimental Americans who weep over Vietnamese babies but do not see their responsibility for the children of America.

"The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world" - a quote from William Ross Wallace. If we want National Security we must have security for America's families. There needs to be a Department of Human Ecology to deal not simply piecemeal with Child and Family Services but to reconstruct our human environment in which children and families exist.

To cite a ~~Vermont~~ ~~Hearing~~ welfare recipient's plea at a State Platform Committee Hearing: "I went to a Mental Health Clinic because I was so depressed living in a low-income housing development where I couldn't sleep because of the brawls on the other side of paper-thin walls; because my son was a constant prey to druggies in the area; because I was too embarrassed to apply for a job without decent clothes and because I was fat and with a low-energy level from eating cheap foods compulsively to cover-up my depression and fatigue. Why couldn't this money they spend on the Mental Health Programs be spent changing some of these ways I am forced to live?"

Will these things change very much for our children while they can live with adults who feel so miserable about themselves for their obesity, rags, low-energy, lack of sleep, neighborhood harrassment, community prejudice, isolation or lack of privacy, alcoholism, drug addiction and depression?

What would decent housing, decent jobs, decent preventive medical care, decent nutrition, decent supportive childcare services and decent recreation services do for low-income families?

Every study in the past dealing with inequality of children's opportunities has asserted that the broader issues involve social reform, but today as in the evolution of the kindergarten the people most aware of the basic issues have retreated into Educationism and talk of Educational not social reform. Such phrases today as "Head Start," "early intervention" presuppose an uneasiness with things as they are for the child of poverty, but rarely and on a diminishing scale do the champions of "preschool" address themselves to the real inequities which exist in the lives of these children from the ghettos, the slums, the low-income "welfare havens," the rural shacks of isolation. The short-lived but hopeful "War on Poverty" embraced Head Start in that first charge of its light brigade, but its energies were dissipated in the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, and finally flickered out. While the ravages of poverty have never wavered, the society is virtually unmoved and unaffected by the type of poverty-above-starvation-levels which we have somehow come to accept in this country today.

We have bought off the hunger marches with welfare and food stamps; we have crushed the Welfare Rights movement by strict adherence to decreased flat grant levels of payment. The inequalities of eligibility for Public Assistance assure the continued antagonism among the poorest segments of the population, the segments eligible and ineligible by poorly analyzed planning. We have made token attempts at housing with no overall plan for creating improvement in community environments, again creating unhealthy ghettos where people live by necessity not choice, breeding further discrimination and recrimination at public expense. "Providing more segregated low-income housing" becomes a prospect at which rich and poor alike shudder. Medicaid, our only completely funded social program for the eligible, creates perhaps the most desperate divisions due to the real advantages to those eligible and ~~the~~ to ~~and~~ the strangely unjust eligibility standards.

Depression and passive aggression are chronic states of the emotional environment of children of the poor. Eventually they may rebel, acquiesce, or succumb; but as children they are, for the most part resiliant, enthusiastic, easily attached to outside influences and quite empathetic. "With a little help from some friends" to quote a haunting refrain, they could make it.

Since the advent of the Early Interventionists like Martin Deutsch of the Institute for Developmental Studies, J. McVicker Hunt of the University of Illinois and Benjamin Bloom of the University of Chicago there has been that hope that if started early enough, children can learn more than we first expected. Phyllis Levenstein, M.B. Karnes, Burton White and David Weikart are proving with control groups that mother-child interaction before three can produce significant cognitive gains in children from environments which might typically be expected to produce low I.Q.s. But whether increasing I.Q. scores is going to increase the chances for the child of poverty to move in a less depressing style through life remains to be seen.

A Child and Family Services bill is only one piece of the pie, but at least it is a step as long as it does not start in the wrong direction. While I believe strongly in integrating services to all children; there must be realistic priorities.

I see the priorities in increasing Child and Family Services as a continuum. At one end are support services to families with children: homebased programs, homemakers, better environments, relief time as a family perhaps in Family Summer Camps or away from children for brief periods; child developmental centers and opportunities for education, training and employment; prenatal medical care tied to infant home programs after birth and parenting education; before and after school and summer programs; at the other end of the continuum is the need for pediatric treatment centers, professional alternate care facilities and training for emergency and long-term foster care parents.

The centerbased programs must be for all-day care for infants to school age anywhere anytime there is a need established for such care without demeaning or pejorative redtape. (Working mothers, sick mothers, nervous mothers, overworked-by-too-many-children mothers, in-training mothers and for children with developmental problems.)

We need these quality Child Development Centers where all types of services are available from budget planning to psychological counseling, as well as programs into the homes with books and equipment for early childhood learning and trained neighborhood child care demonstrators; prenatal medical care tied into infant stimulation continuing well after birth. And all this is available on a free and sliding scale basis.

In addition to these program priorities of immediate necessity, I see human ecological improvement in the areas of nutrition and preventive health care, environmental housing integration, full employment under Public Service for Social Services.

* * * * * *

There are obvious pitfalls which could occur in new Children's Program legislation. Let me cite some of them based in my ten years of experience with government programs. (Head Start, OEO, FAP, Title IVA)

1. Too much is attempted too quickly and bad systems are set in motion. Head Start now has some dreadful programs in place which nobody in 10 years has been able to curb due to inadequate to nonexistant standards with self-serving procedures and no accountability. Professional controls and standards should be required. Within standards community control can still be respected.

There are trained Child Development people looking for jobs; these programs should make it possible for them to work, and trained leadership is necessary; children's programs can not be looked on as great employers-of-last-resort. But training and education must continue both as a function of Educational Institutions subsidized by government and concurrently using the qualified Programs as on-the-job training sites.

2. Individual demonstration programs of high quality - if that is all you can afford - are better advertising for additional funding than many bad programs. Good leadership can train on-the-job, should accept Public Service funded employees, etc. but professional standards must be established first.

Good materials for judgement are the Head Start Performance Standards, FDIC Daycare Standards, CDA (Child Development Associate) competencies among others.

3. Bureaucratism - our national plague. Every precaution must be taken not to set up competing and conflicting bureaucracies with wheel-spinning Civil Service employees. I have been tempted to ask for a Citizens Evaluation of Regional OCD and OHD Offices. It is hard for me sometimes to comprehend what all those people do for what appear to us as big salaries.

4. Protect what is good which now exists and build on rather than tear down in order to rebuild. Actually we believe that all we need in our program is more money. SRS, Mental Health and other agencies wish we could do more, expand facilities, set up similar programs in other towns. So the wheel does not have to be reinvented: we simply need more money.

1) To maintain present program:
   a. We need the Head start cost-of-living increase appropriation to be passed by the Senate and we need to realize it in our local programs. I have

opposed repeatedly such increases to programs of poor or questionable quality. We need a 20% increase just to do next year what we set out to do this year.

b. We need transportation vehicles desperately. I mention this particularly as an aspect of trying to do anything in a rural area. Low-income persons are paralized even when they want to work and have a job because they cannot move. If government is discussing subsidizing the auto industry, programs such as ours would be productive beneficiaries.

c. We need to increase our ratio of professional/trainee staff. What we tend to do is demand heruclean efforts on the part of a few to maintain quality. We demand an emotional and physical commitment matched by few people in few jobs, certainly not the "bureaucrats" who think up the piles of white mimeo paper red tape!

2) To expand our program to other rural areas in our vicinity which are unable to reach us - again due to the complexities and unavailability of transportation as well as distances:

a. buildings - a desperate need for money to convert old buildings and build new ones. We have had none so far, and we exist where we are purely on personal donation and generosity.

b. to build in more family support services we need family and child counselors built in to the programs; now we really scramble for these support services, frequently traveling into New Hampshire to get them.

5. Some real efforts should be made to involve the schools more deeply in before and after school and summer programming and concern for the lives of school-age children. They need more money to enlarge their mandate, but here in Vermont I do not sense unwillingness on the part of educators to be involved. Fortunately in most areas our schools have not slipped into a narrow, academic definition of "education." On the whole the educational establishment appears friendly to a humanistic approach. They need to be far more involved; they need to communicate far better with us and we with them, because we still are divided into "us" and "them."

6. Some catch-all anxieties in connection with the bill and publicity around it.

1) Shanker's AFT move to take over Child Care Services appears absurd from where we sit, but if it is a reality then the bill must protect against this. No-one except the community folks should control hiring with professional standards and personnel criteria set by Early Childhood Educators and Child Development Specialists.
2) Another fear is that somehow private-for-profit groups will be beneficiaries of the bill. If a per-child

voucher system is used this should be possible, but the start-up, building and maintenance and travel subsidies which are necessary should go only to non-profit corporations with community-controlled Boards.

* * * * * *

We are cutting back programs, scrimping, barely surviving and any relief can keep us even; but America and Vermont need more than this. Our children and their families need so much if we are to survive as a humane society. In the local Springfield weekly, a Police Chief bemoaned the enormous increase in crime, vandalism and drug usage even in the small community of Springfield with 10,000 people; and I wrote him a letter in sympathy. What he and the police force face is simply an epidemic of societal neglect: families under stress, children neglected and/or rejected.

Dear Chief Martin,

The causes of the rising crime, vandalism and drug usage are as tragic as their effects; but they are not unknown or mysterious.

Child Abuse is a crime and very dramatic when it is physically caused. Psychological child abuse and neglect is more subtle, less noticeable but equally tragic, bearing fruit later in that child-grown-up vandaliser, drug user, real criminal. (And there should be a distinction made between the types of law-breakers although I would agree they are all symptomatic of underlying problems.)

Little children grow up. This amazingly simple fact is myopically ignored by too many adults. If they have been rejected, neglected or continuously given the feeling they are bad, in-the-way, disturbing someone and so on this accumulates into some very hostile feelings. Generally as a child there is no way to hit back, because a child knows that (s)he can't win against the big adult with that big hand or strap.

Many people have the impression that "the State" comes along and takes away kids that are abused, but this is so only in rare, most obvious cases. First of all there are few enough better alternatives, and the goal in social work today definitely is to keep children with their original families. Another reason very little children are not taken away when it might do some good to counteract rejective effects (if there really were better alternatives), is that courts tend not to believe State Social Service people partly based on historical prejudice and partly based on ignorance of child development. But the greatest reason for society ignoring child abuse and neglect is that it is culturally acceptable!

Yes, I believe that our society is a violent one generally condoning slapping children; that for all the politicians - kissing - babies, motherhood-of-the-year sentiment our society generally does not like children. The evidence for this is in society's failure to provide well either for children or the adults who care for them.

The effects of early deprivation (both emotional and nutritional), the effects of neglect and battering, of rejection, simply of raising a child with a bad self-image are easily and clearly demonstrated in the delinquency and crime you speak of.

Let's get together a community and, eventually, hopefully a joint State Task Force on Crime and Child Abuse and Neglect and not just "wonder what satisfaction there is in complete destruction." (S.R. March 20) We know what that satisfaction is: it is a reaction to being rejected, maybe beaten, told you were no good, compared negatively to another child; certainly not hugged, loved, enjoyed, cuddled, played with, told you were someone special as a baby and young child.

Because I feel so strongly about this I am sending a copy of this letter to the newspaper in which I read your statements. Please know I sympathize with you on your end of the job. On my end of the job we are making only a little drop in-the-bucket progress with a little center serving only a tiny number of children. The whole issue needs community airing; healthy, whole children need places to grow and develop; mothers need tremendous support in their role and frequently relief to a lesser or greater degree. Every mother is not a natural child developer any more than every daddy is an engineer. Poverty sometimes compounds the problem, but let me emphasize that child abuse and neglect is an insidious hidden sickness of frustrated, unhappy middle and upper income mothers who need support and/or

> relief too. The society needs not just Recreation Programs but Infant Care Centers, Child Development Centers, Before School Breakfast, Supervised After School Programs, Emergency Voluntary Overnight Foster Care and most of all people who care, care, care...
>
> Sincerely yours,
> Ann Raynolds

The new moves on "Child Abuse and Neglect" are laudable but pejorative in a sense. We need the support services to PREVENT child abuse and neglect; the negative labelling for these program demonstrations is another piecemeal step.

"Children Learn What They Live" is a well-known poem used in the Head Start Parent education program. It says essentially that if children live with love they will be loving; if they live with hate they will hate; that modeling what we wish our children to be is truly the best, perhaps the only, educational method. We must all care more for one another as a community if we would have our children grow up to care for each other, for their community, and for this nation.

> What is called for is greater involvement of parents, and other adults, in the lives of children, and -- conversely -- greater involvement of children in responsibility on behalf of their own family, community, and society at large. Given the fragmented character of modern American life -- its growing separatism and violence -- such an injunction may appear to some as a pipe dream, but it need not be. For just as autonomy and aggression have their roots in the American tradition, so have neighborliness, civic concern, and devotion to the young. It is to these that we must look if we are to rediscover our moral identity as a society and as a nation. (Ibid. p. 170)

BY-LAWS

CONSUMER CONTROLLED COMMUNITY CHILD CARE, INC.

Adopted 5/1/72

(5-C)

Revised 3/11/74

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of the corporation shall be "Consumer Controlled Community Child Care, (5-C), Inc."

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

The purpose of this non-profit corporation shall be to plan and operate quality child development services in Windsor and Windham Counties and to assure parent policy control and cooperation in these programs. The corporation is not organized for the pecuniary profit of its directors, officers or members, nor may any of its net income, after operating expenses of all kinds, inure to the benefit of any director, officer or member, and any balance of money or assets remaining after the full payment of corporate obligations of all and any kind shall be devoted solely to the charitable, educational and benevolent purposes of this corporation.

This corporation shall not carry on any activities not permitted to be carried on (a) by a corporation exempt from federal income tax under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the corresponding section of any future U. S. Internal Revenue law) or (b) by a corporation contribution to which are deductible under Section 170 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the corresponding section of any future U. S. Internal Revenue laws). Furthermore, the purpose shall be to acquire by purchase, gift, devise, bequest, lease or otherwise own, hold, use, maintain, improve, operate, post for bail and to sell, lease and otherwise dispose of real and personal property, and to do everything necessary and proper to the conduct of said purposes, including the power to borrow funds and to mortgage and; to do any legal act or thing to carry out any activities or transact business, necessary, related or incident to the aforesaid purposes.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERS

All parents whose children are currently enrolled in a center, or whose children were enrolled at anytime in the preceding twelve months, and all members of the Board of Directors, present and past, shall be members of the corporation. A list of members shall be kept by the secretary of the corporation, with their names and addresses.

ARTICLE IV - BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1 - Size

The size of the Board shall be determined by the number of child development centers or programs run by the corporation. Under no circumstances shall any Director, while on the Board, or any of his relatives, be actively employed by the 5-C Corporation.

Section 2 - Composition

The Board of Directors will consist of three groups as follows:

a) Consumer Section
  Each child development center or program shall elect two members of the Board from among the membership of its Center Committee; one member to be elected every year for two years. Membership in each Center Committee is defined as parents of children currently enrolled in the program at the Center.

b) Non-Consumer Section
  The Consumer Section of the Board will in turn elect additional individuals equal to the number of consumers currently elected to the Board, such individuals to serve for two years and to be:

  1. Individuals selected from public or privage agencies or organizations which provide child development or care services in Windham or Windsor Counties.
  2. Interested citizens who are residents of Windham or Windsor counties.

c) Policy Council Section
  The Policy Council will elect one Policy Council member from each center to serve on the Board of Directors.

Section 3 - Term of Office

Elections of new Directors shall be held as follows:

a) Consumer Section: At the January meeting of each Center Committee
b) Non-Consumer Section: At the regular February meeting of the Board.
c) Policy Council Section: At the February Meeting of the Policy Council.

The term of office for all Directors will be for two years beginning with the February meeting of the Board of Directors.

Section 4 - Vacancies

a) Vacancies in the Non-Consumer portion of the Board shall be filled by the majority vote of the remaining Directors.

b) Vacancies on the consumer portion of the Board shall be filled by the appropriate Center Committee at its next regular meeting following a resignation.

c) acancies on the Policy Council portion of the Board shall be filled by the Policy Council at its next regular meeting following a resignation.

d) Absences by any Directors at two successive Board meetings without satisfactory explanation shall constitute a resignation from the Board. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Corporation to notify the respective groups responsible for electing Directors to the Board as vacancies occur so that new Directors may be promptly elected.

Section 5 - Quorum

A quorum shall consist of 1/3 or total number of persons on the Board of Directors.

Section 6 - Standing Committees

a) The Executive Committee shall be composed of the Officers of the Board and the Chairman of the Policy Council. The Director-Fiscal Officer and Educational Director are ex-officio members without vote. It shall be empowered to act for the Board on emergency situations when the convening of a full Board meeting is impossible. The decisions of the Executive Committee will be subject to review by the Board at its next meeting.

b) The Program Committee shall consist of 4 consumers and two non-consumer representatives. It will be an informational committee to educate Board members on their roles and responsibilities. It should be the committees responsibility to work with the Center Committee Chairman to educate the new Board members as to history, functions, and goals of 5-C, Inc.

c) The Personnel Committee shall be composed of one consumer representative from each Center, and two representatives from the non-consumer section of the Board.

Section 6 - Standing Committees (cont'd)

d) A Nominating Committee of three persons may be appointed by the Chairman to propose nominations for the non-Consumer section of the Board of Directors at the November meeting. The consumer portion of the Board may elect non-consumer directors from among the nominations presented.

The Board of Directors may appoint such additional committees as it deems necessary to carry out the business of the Corporation.

Section 7 - Meetings

a) Regular meetings: There shall be at least one regular meeting of the Board of Directors in the months of November, February, March, May and September. Notices of meetings including time, date and place shall be given in writing at least seven days prior to any meeting.

b) Special meetings: The Chairman may call special meetings whenever necessary, upon notice as outlined in (a) above.

c) Meetings by petition of the Board of Directors may be called by any one third of the Board of Directors, providing seven days written notice of time, date, place and agenda is given to all Directors prior to the meeting.

ARTI LE V - OFFICERS

The officers shall be elected at the March meeting of the Board (and vacancies filled) by the Board of Directors from among their numbers. They shall consist of Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary. The term of office will be for one year beginning with the March meeting of the Board.

a) Chairman: The Chairman shall preside at all meetings of the Officers, the Board of Directors and members or until new officers are elected. The Chairman shall call meetings and set up the agenda with the approval of the other officers.

b) Vice-Chairman: In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman will assume the duties of the Chairman.

c) Secretary: The Secretary shall keep minutes of all meetings of the Officers, Board of Directors and members, and shall furnish copies of same on request. The Secretary shall deliver notices of meetings of the Board of Directors and members as instructed by the Chairman. The Secretary shall keep an accurate and up-to-date list of members, their addresses and phone numbers, and the correct date of initiating membership. The Secretary shall be responsible for providing members with receipts indicating date initiating membership. The Secretary shall conduct correspondence of the corporation of the officers and Board of Directors. The Secretary shall be given a copy of all resignations.

d) Treasurer: The Treasurer shall have custody of the funds of the corporation and may draw checks in payment of its obligations subject to directions of the Board of Directors. The Treasurer shall prepare a written statement of financial transactions for the previous year to present to the members at the annual meeting and shall prepare such statements from time to time at the direction of the Chairman, officers or Board of Directors. All funds shall be deposited in such depositories as may be designated by the Board of Directors, and subjected to an annual audit.

ARTICLE VI - MEETINGS

Annual meeting: The annual meeting of the corporation shall consist of the local center committee meetings to be held in the month of October at such times and places as designated by each center committee. Special Meetings may be called by the Chairman of the Board provided that notice of the meeting, including time, date, place and agenda shall be sent to all members at least two weeks prior to the date of the meeting. A quorum at any special meeting will consist of any fifteen members.

ARTICLE VII - PERSONNEL

The Board of Directors will adopt Personnel Policies and Procedures, which will be consistent with OCD and other pertinent guidelines and regulations.

ARTICLE VIII - AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any regular or special meeting of the Board of Directors provided that the text of the proposed amendments shall be set forth in the written notice of the meeting.

The change in the By-Laws voted March 11, 1974 as it affects the election of Directors will take effect as follows:

In January, 1975 one consumer from each program and an equal number of non-consumers will be elected for one year (to Jan. 1976) and one consumer from each program and an equal number of non-consumers will be elected for two years (to Jan. 1977). The Policy Council representatives elected by Policy Council (in February 1975) to serve on the Board will serve two years (to Feb. 1977).

Senator STAFFORD. Before we go to the final witnesses, the Chair will note that the administration requested $20 million additional this year for Head Start funding to take care of cost of living pressures. The House has passed this. The House has also passed an additional $6 million for cost of living and services to the handicapped, and that the Magnuson subcommittee on the Senate, Appropriations Committee, currently has the legislation. My colleagues from staff on both sides of me tell me that the outlook in the Magnuson subcommittee is favorable. The staff is talking about adding $14 million to the $36 million that came over from the House. I would personally estimate the Senate reaction to the committee's report, when it comes, will be favorable, also. Also, let's note for the record that in the bill as it is before this subcommittee the child and family services legislation if enacted cannot be funded unless Head Start is funded at least at its last year's level to prevent taking funds from that program for the very poor. The child and family services' funding must be in addition to Head Start. Also, 65 percent of the funds in the bill are reserved for free services to families with incomes below $9,200 rather than $4,000 and must be distributed equitably among those families. We wanted to make that a part of the hearing record. Now, the Chair is going to invite Mr. Robert V. Daniels, a member of the health and welfare committee of the Vermont State Senate, and Madeleine Kunin of Burlington, who is a member of the Vermont House and its appropriations committee, and a member of the Governor's commission on children and youth. Would you care to take the witness table. Senator Daniels, do you wish to go first or do you defer to the house?

Mr. DANIELS. I have already deferred to the house.

STATEMENT OF HON. MADELEINE KUNIN, MEMBER, STATE OF VERMONT HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. KUNIN. I am Madeleine Kunin from Burlington. I am here, in two capacities. One, as a parent, and, two, as a State legislator. I have just jotted down some responses to things as I have been listening. As a parent, I have had the experience of having a child in a day care center, even though I could afford to pay the costs, I found that a day care center is preferable to having a private babysitter come into the home because of the educational experience involved.

As a State legislator, I first became involved with day care about 2 years ago when the Federal regulations were changed and a state of panic kind of took over Vermont at that point. I cosponsored a resolution to study day care in the legislature, which was passed. That study of day care broadened into a study of child services in general. You probably heard some testimony about what has come about in that regard; there is now an interagency council on child development. That experience might be applicable here in that day care is very hard to isolate from child services in general. When you start out with a limited defined problem, you find out that it impinges on everything else.

Another thing that I have learned through the legislative and appropriations process is that even when there are lots of good programs there is competition and jealousy. You may have day care funds competing with foster care funds, day care competing with Head Start funds. I am sure that you are aware of this on the Federal level. I think that this is something that we should be concerned about, that we do not rob Peter to save Paul and that we do not underfund other programs in order to start new ones. Another thing that I learned through being involved with this committee, is that it is very important to have training funds. I realize that this is spelled out in the bill, but I realize also, watching State government at work, whenever anything is cut it is always the training money. You really have to have incentives for training. In talking to some day care workers, they do not have time to take off from their jobs to attend a training session.

While what you have heard here today is all in praise of day care in Vermont, there are obviously many day care centers and day care homes that are not adequate, that are not well staffed and that you would not want your child or I would not want my child to spend any time in. While I favor day call, you have to evaluate each individual situation and make sure that there are trained people there. Not necessarily people trained academically or with degrees, but I think people who have learned the skills from others.

The other thing that I think is terribly important, that I see is there in the bill, is monitoring the program. I think the monitoring should also be done on a local level so you really have a view of what is happening. I think sometimes that parents are so anxious to have their child in some kind of care that they themselves do not have the time or the inclination to see what kind of care is being provided. This age child is obviously very vulnerable and very impressionable and I think it is all the more important the child himself or herself cannot always communicate if care is not adequate.

Another thing that I touched on before is coordination of child services. We, in Vermont, are having a very hard time figuring out how to coordinate children's services and we are a small State with a relatively small bureaucracy and a small population. If this is true on our level, I am sure that it is a thousand times more true on the Federal level. I think this is a thing to bear in mind with this type of legislation, that there is not duplication and that each branch of Government knows where the involvement is; and, also, that the consumer knows how to reach Government, how to reach the right person for the answer to the questions that will undoubtedly arise.

Another thing that I have learned is that Federal legislation is often not appropriate to a State like Vermont. I am sure that that is the major reason why you are here. In the section on minority groups, they talk about Indians and migrant workers. Well, obviously, we do not qualify. We do have other minority groups, however; I think that French Canadians may, in some instance, be considered minority groups. Of course, we have the rural poor. I think that it is important to have enough flexibility so that a State can work out, or a region can work out, its own priorities as to who should receive special funding.

Another thing, being on the Appropriations Committee, I have learned about Federal programs and Federal money. I have learned that it is very hard to refuse, especially in a year such as the one we have been through. However, at the same time that Federal money is hard to refuse, I think that State legislatures are becoming very wary of accepting some money that they know is going to continue on a declined Federal match. There is really a very strict review of this. There is no guarantee that when the Federal share goes down that the State really has the capability of picking up that increased cost. I see this as a real problem. I realize that that is how the Federal Government works and that is how you determine whether a community really wants something, if it is willing to make a financial commitment to it. It really is a problem, and I do not know how that could be handled. Perhaps maybe a more gradual decline or a longer full percentage commitment, I do not know. I think that it is something that has to be borne in mind because a poor State like Vermont, poor in terms of revenues, really will find it difficult, to come up with the matching funds on a continuing basis.

Another part that has been brought up is the rules and regulations that are issued after the legislation is passed. I know that the Vermont Legislature has problems with rules and regulations, as I am sure that Congress does. This is, I think, where a lot of the problems arise where you have eligibility standards that vary, that are almost, you know, bizarre sometimes in how they fluctuate. This is where local people get very anxious You create false distinctions between who should qualify and who should not, and you really force people down the ladders sometimes in order to qualify instead of encouraging them to go up the ladder. So, I will just say, that however you handle rules and regulations, to make them as flexible and as broad as possible. Maybe something on the border of what has been recommended as a general welfare reform to just ask income and not have any other, like single parent, working parent, and so forth, and match on the basis of income and not get into a whole lot of very sophisticated categories. I think that is about the sum of my comments this morning.

Senator STAFFORD. We appreciate particularly your coming over here. Without taking the time of the hearing at the present time, if you do not have a copy of S. 626 we will see that you get one.

Mrs. KUNIN. I have the House bill.

Senator STAFFORD. The Senate bill is slightly different but quite similar to it in most respects. At one point in it, on page 42, which has language in it saying, "no State or unit of general local government shall reduce its expenditures for child development or child care programs by reasons of assistance under this title." In another area, it has some language on page 43 which has to do with rules and regulations. Aside from this regulation, the Chair will have to concede that sometimes even the Senate is surprised at the rules and regulations which appear as the result of legislation which we have adopted. Finally, the Chair is aware that you are aware of the attractiveness of Federal money and also some of the problems that go with it. I recall it on the basis of a question you asked me in Durham, N.H., about 2 or 3 months ago at a meeting down there. We very much appreciate your being here. Now, Senator, we will be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT V. DANIELS, MEMBER, STATE OF VERMONT SENATE

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will try to keep my remarks brief and get a written statement to you next week. By and large, I think that the bill is excellent in intent. I am glad to see it. It has some obvious advantages. I need not dwell on them, particularly enabling families to stay off welfare and getting more of an educational and services component into day care. The thing that I was particularly concerned about myself, having served last year as chairman on the Governor's Commission on Medical Care in Vermont, was the emphasis on that very broad screening program for medical and dental problems and handicaps, whether they be emotional, physical, or whatever. In that connection, I certainly would like to second the remarks that John Abbott made from his personal experience. I think that it is tremendously important. We have many pieces of this kind of program, in fact, various overlapping screening programs. I imagine that here, as well as in day care itself, we should take note of what Mrs. Raynolds said about the piling of piecemeal programs one on top of the other leading to more bureaucracy and less performance. If you are going to have medical screening of children, maybe the time has come to meld it all into one comprehensive program that is universally available.

I have some concerns about the operation of the bill in Vermont. Really, I think that I would give the committee more questions than suggestions myself. First of all, it is not quite clear whether the bill is designed really to create a universal day care system that is universally available or whether it is merely the opportunity for local initiative by States and local government, and so forth, where they take the bit in their own teeth. It is also not quite clear whether certain parts of the program can be taken advantage of without doing it all. For instance, if a locality feels that they are doing enough in day care but would need the medical screening, can they develop a proposal that emphasizes the screening and the special services, and so forth? It would not qualify perhaps as comprehensive as some of the criteria are defined. I would be concerned that there would be enough flexibility to look at a community proposal that is zeroing in on one aspect of the child care problem that may be of more concern to them.

The definition of a "prime sponsor" concerned me somewhat. As I read it, it appears that a prime sponsor can be either a State government or a local government. But, if a local government opts to be a prime sponsor and has a program that qualifies, the locality is allowed, in effect, to secede from the State and the State can then only be the prime sponsor for what is left of the State.

Senator STAFFORD. We will not attempt to answer you as you go along, Senator.

Mr. DANIELS. I was not expecting that, Mr. Chairman, but rather just to put my concerns on the record here. Undoubtedly, some of these have been discussed or thought about before, but that is the extent that I can contribute to ironing out any problems. I think that allowing such a system of a locality opting out of the State and then, say, having Burlington with its program, and the State of Vermont with the rest is administratively very awkward. It creates problems when the State, through the legislature or whatever, would like to take initiative and develop programs for the State and assume a measure of responsibility only to find perhaps that a key community is not part of it for these purposes. I would prefer to see the bill revised to allow the State to be the prime sponsor for the whole State if it chooses to do so.

Now, you may have problems with New York State versus New York City, and I imagine that that may have been in the back of the mind of the bill drafter. Perhaps if the locality is over a million people or something like that, you may allow them to get an exemption. I think that in Vermont it would be administratively very awkward, particularly the problem of where the matching funds come from. Let's say that Burlington pulled out of Vermont, then Burlington would have to come up with the 10- or 20-percent match out of city revenues. Then would the State of Vermont be able to use the statewide tax revenues, which Burlington has contributed to, to pay for only the program in the rest of the State, or would it have to then kick back a pro rata portion to Burlington? You can imagine the kind of fiscal complexities that you would run into if that were not cleared up—another reason I think for sticking with the State as the responsible unit, with then all possible emphasis on local decentralization through the use of those local councils beneath the State level.

The problem with the way that the matching funds work, assuming that we are working with the State as a unit, that is section 111(e) provides that a State cannot cut its present spending, or I guess a prime sponsor, cannot cut its present spending and enjoy the program, but it has to provide the match which will be ultimately 20 percent. My question is, will the present level of spending, which cannot be cut, count as the match in the future? If it does not, we are in trouble, bad trouble. I think that the bill ought to clarify that present levels of State funding for purposes covered by the bill will be considered as qualifying for the State match unless they are already matching other existing Federal programs, which, of course, a lot of it is.

Just a couple of other briefer points. I certainly would underscore the emphasis on the transportation problem that has been brought up here. I did not hear it mentioned, but, of course, we do have one system of statewide rural mass transportation, and that is the school buses, which work very well. I do not see why we could not work with school districts in utilizing that service as long, of course, as the space is available.

There is a clause on qualifications of employees, page 27 of the Senate bill, section 106(b)(10). That provides that "no person will be denied employment in any program solely on the grounds that such person fails to meet State or local teachers certification standards." Now, that may be fine for jobs that do not require the qualifications of a teacher, but if there are jobs in a program like this, and I know a little bit about early childhood education through my wife's work with the Burlington Early Essential Education Center last year, that the professional qualifications for some aspects of that kind of work may be even more demanding than for an ordinary classroom teacher. To say that you cannot deny employment for a certain kind of job because a person fails to meet certification standards, I think is just an invitation to disaster. I hope that that language can somehow be corrected. I understand the point, which is to open up various kinds of day care work to paraprofessionals and volunteers and parents who get trained for it and people who are unemployed and get trained for it; but that is only certain kinds of jobs and there are other aspects of this program which I think have got to be kept professional. I think we had better be sure that we do not do anything to compromise it.

Senator **Stafford**. We will comment that this same point was raised yesterday two or three times but you have given it emphasis today.

Mr. **Daniels**. One final point, and this specifically relates to Vermont. Mrs. Kunin touched on it already. That is in the provision for programs for minority children and the reference to bilingual programs and bilingual families. Of course, we do have a minority of sorts in Vermont, a population of French-Canadian background which, depending on the generation, may be more or less assimilated to the Vermont population as a whole, but certainly has some distinctive traditions, and in some parts of the State some distinctive problems. I think that we should be careful with the language to make sure that the language problem is not identified with the minority problem. It is my understanding that the Federal Government defines minorities as blacks, orientals, Indians and Puerto Ricans, but not anybody else because they do not appear physically to be racial minorities. If the bilingual problem is confined to racial minorities, it would be dealing primarily with the Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest and the Puerto Ricans in the cities in the Northeast. I think that there are certain very important and very legitimate reasons why we should be able to deal with educational problems, particularly with children from French-Canadian families in Vermont, regardless of the question of a racial minority. I hope that the bill can be clarified to avoid any interpretation that confines the opportunity of dealing with bilingual problems, foreign language problems, that would confine it only to racial minorities.

I might remind the committee of the reference on page 8, section 102(b)(f) to the special needs of ethnic groups, children from families with special language needs, and meeting the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural backgrounds of ethnic groups. We have in Vermont a Vermont French Cultural Commission now which I was privileged to cosponsor last year, comparable to similar commissions in all the New England States dealing with the encouragement of interest in the French language, the cultural background of Franco-Americans, cultural exchanges, whatever it might be; so that we have now in existence under the chairmanship of Father Marcoux of Winooski a vehicle which can directly proceed, provided that it is funded. At the present time they do not have any money at all. They are geared up to do some interesting things if they can qualify under the act. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude, and thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Senator **Stafford**. Senator, we certainly appreciate your appearance and your very careful analysis of some of the problems that this committee will face in drafting a final version of S. 626. Mrs. Kunin, we very much appreciate your appearance, too. As a footnote, the Chair will note that the professional staff, who with me, will be glad to discuss this matter informally with you and/or with either of you two if you care to after we have closed the hearings. Before we do, the Chair will call your attention, Senator, to the fact that on page 56 of the bill we do try to take care, and think we have taken care, of the problem of Canadian-Americans who are from a French-speaking background because we have defined minority groups to include, skipping a bit, "children who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English," which we think covers French-speaking children. The Chair can't help but remember seeing a sign on the road to Montreal just north of the American border which said, "English spoken, American understood." We thank you both very much for appearing with us. Before the Chair closes this hearing, the Chair wants the record to show at this point that there is no bias on the part of the present acting chairman or the subcommittee in full or the full committee on questions involving the State vis-a-vis a local prime sponsor. That is something that the full subcommittee will work out on the basis of further hearings and on the basis of the testimony which we have received during these 2 days of hearings. Unless there is further business or somebody who has not been heard who wishes 2 minutes, the Chair is going to declare these hearings adjourned.

Questions submitted to witnesses on April 25 and 26, 1975 with accompanying responses will be printed as appendix A and B.

These hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth are in adjournment.

[Whereupon at 1:15 p.m., the subcommittee was recessed.]

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO WITNESSES APPEARING ON APRIL 25, 1975 FOR WRITTEN ANSWERS

The Committee has received much testimony from across the country and in Vermont concerning three important matters which deal with the general operation of the Child and Family Services Act. We would appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1.) What role should local school boards and authorities play in the administration of a child development family services program? Should they be given a priority for being prime sponsors or administrators of a child development plan as is supported by the unions and teachers organizations?

2.) Much testimony has been given concerning the role of private for profit day care centers being allowed to receive federal funding under this program. What do you feel the federal attitude should be toward profit making in day care centers as compared to private, non-profits, which now operate and do receive federal support?

3.) The principal component in the operation of a child and family related day care center is the involvement of the parents. To what extent should you be involved in the policy making decisions of a day care center and the day to day operational decisions of a day care center? Should you be required to spend time in a day care center to assist the staff of the centers?

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO WITNESSES APPEARING ON APRIL 25, 1975 IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE

ROBERT T. STAFFORD
VERMONT

[illegible] SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
TEL. (202) [illegible]

[illegible] J. HOUSTON
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D.C. [illegible]

COMMITTEES:
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
PUBLIC WORKS
VETERANS' AFFAIRS
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

July 17, 1975

Honorable Thomas C. Davis
Secretary
Agency of Human Services
128 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602

Dear Tom:

Please excuse the mix-up in the previous letter you got on the testimony for the Child and Family Services hearing. Due to a problem with the printer, the hearings were not available and the letter was sent out accidentally by the Committee staff. Attached you will find a set of the hearings along with instructions. It would be appreciated if they could be returned as soon as possible.

During the hearing you will remember that I stated that the Committee wanted time to review the testimony and submit questions in writing. After reviewing your testimony, and that of other Vermont witnesses, Senator Mondale and I would like to address two questions which came up during the Montpelier hearing and during our other hearings held on the Child and Family Services Act.

1.) Before the Subcommittee in Montpelier you brought forth a common criticism of the programs of serving poor people. Administrative bureaucracies and the bill would add another layer on top of the existing structures on both the state and federal level. The Committee would appreciate very much your thoughts in some detail as to the best way to structure the delivery system of this bill so as not to create additional bureaucracies yet provide for sufficient local control so that programs operating at the local level can be family orientated to meet the local need for child care.

2.) As you are no doubt aware, the Committee is in possession of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's evaluation report entitled "Day Care in Vermont." This report does level some criticisms at the existing delivery system for services and the Committee would appreciate your responses to this report so that we may have a balanced view for making judgments on the implementation of the delivery system for this bill.

We would appreciate it very much if you would take the time to answer these questions. It would be very helpful to the Committee, as we now begin to study this bill in Executive Session.

Sincerely yours,

Robt T. Stafford

Walter F. Mondale
United States Senator

Robert T. Stafford
United States Senator

RTS/WFM/mk

Enclosures

79 RIVER STREET
MONTPELIER, VERMONT 05602
(802) 828-2471

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

STATE OF VERMONT
AGENCY OF HUMAN SERVICES

August 21, 1975

Honorable Robert T. Stafford
United States Senator
5219 Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

I'm pleased to have an opportunity to expand somewhat on my April testimony and to address your specific questions:

(1) Regarding the HEW "Day Care In Vermont" report, I doubt its usefulness at this point. That report reviewed the weaknesses of that day care program in Vermont in June of 1972. It found a separation of State planning and operational functions; insufficient planning time; unclear, irregular or conflicting Federal assistance and direction; a splintering of responsibility among two different State offices, various Federal bureaucracies and eight (8) Regional 4-C Offices. The weakness it cited may be instructive. As you are no doubt aware, however, a number of significant changes have altered the delivery system for social services in Vermont; particularly in the day care program. Those changes were of such magnitude that "Day Care In Vermont" does not reflect our present day care program. I strongly urge that you consider more current and relevant information when making judgments on the implementation of a delivery system for the Child and Family Services Act.

The mechanism for State coordination and accountability is now in place here in Vermont as a product of the creation of the Agency of Human Services. I hope that mechanism is used as such, with a clear and single point of corresponding Federal responsibility, in the implementation of the Child and Family Services Act.

AGING CHILD DEVELOPMENT CORRECTIONS ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY HEALTH
MANPOWER SERVICES MENTAL HEALTH SOCIAL & REHABILITATION SERVICES SOCIAL WELFARE

(2) As I indicated in my testimony, I would suggest that the Child and Family Services Act place responsibility for implementation and prime sponsorship with the States. As in Title XX, I would require that each State clearly identify where its responsibility will lie; and develop, with public input and hearing, a plan for implementation. An appeal route that circumvents the States should, I think, be available and clearly spelled out; but I believe State governments have the capacity and the responsibility to be the most representative and effective locus of accountability for implementing the Act as it is intended.

In Vermont, local town government is held accountable through its elected officials and the town meeting process. On the State level, the Executive branch is held accountable through the Legislature. The Agency of Human Services is currently building on that existing design for accountability and I feel strongly that a State government is more directly accountable to the citizens of Vermont than a proliferation of "boards" would be. I don't feel the Legislative branch on the Federal level should ignore the elected representatives of State government and assume that non-elected persons will be accountable. That would be but another finesse of general purpose government, weakening, not strengthening accountability.

By the same token, I would advise against the Federal government mandating that local school boards or anybody else receive top priority or mandating that either private or non-profit facilities be given priority treatment. If the legislation is adequately funded, the States should be able to devise and monitor appropriate rate structures and program and service specifications themselves.

The question of "parent involvement" is, of course, complicated and important. It is my opinion that the development of a publicly articulated Child and Family Services plan in each state will--with the stipulations listed below--provide for fully satisfactory citizen input and parent involvement:

Each "plan" should provide for services to families based significantly on the family's own assessment of its needs;

Each service should provide for parent evaluation and a parents' advisory group; and

A clear route of appeal should be established for any dissatisfied parent or parent group.

I feel that such a plan should build on and complement the existing service programs, such as Title XX. It should be adequately funded and it should specify program components and services.

I hope this letter has answered your questions. If you need additional information on the current status of service programs for families and children in Vermont, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Davis
Secretary

TCD:pc

STATE OF VERMONT
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MONTPELIER
05602

November 7, 1975

Senator Robert T. Stafford
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of October 24, 1975. I am very much interested in the follow-up to the hearing on the Child and Family Services Act that the Subcommittee on Children and Youth held in Montpelier, Vermont in April of 1975.

The copy you mailed of the official transcript of my statement at the hearing is enclosed. I have inserted a footnote on the Vermont paper in red as requested for minor clarifying changes. The footnote is

Vermont State Department of Education.
Report on Early Childhood Education in Vermont.
December 12, 1974

A copy of the above-mentioned report is being mailed to you under separate cover.

Below, I have repeated the two questions in your letter and followed each with my views on the matter.

Question 1.) Since the hearing that was held in Vermont, the AFL-CIO and the American Federation of Teachers have taken a firm stand that local school agencies should be prime sponsors for any child and family services program. As an individual who is involved in the operation of such a program, we should very much appreciate your views on this matter.

Response - School agencies should be the prime sponsors. State and local school agencies should share the leadership responsibilities. State Education Agencies should not be by-passed. The management system at the state level should be developed in such a way that it articulates effectively with the parallel structure and services at the local level.

Quotes from the Report on Early Childhood Education in Vermont (December 12, 1974) are given below:

"Recommendations -

. . That the Vermont State Department of Education become the lead agency in establishing State public policy on early childhood education and related services, develop and maintain liaison with other appropriate agencies and persons, provide leadership in the development of a plan to implement this public policy, accept responsibility for managing financial resources necessary for the educational program, and provide leadership in the organization of a delivery system which will incorporate the responsibilities, concerns, and resources of state agencies and appropriate components of the private sector providing related services.

. . That a local early childhood health and education resource council be appointed by the local school board with the concurrence of the board of selectmen (or aldermen) to serve in each town/supervisory school district. The council would draw membership from public health nurses, visiting nurses, school nurses, physicians, guidance officers, school attendance officer, social service caseworkers, school bus drivers, highway and transportation personnel, parents, day care personnel, kindergarten and other primary level teachers, school board members, selectmen, principals, and the superintendent of schools, ex officio.

. . Working under the direction of the superintendent of schools, the local resource council would advise and assist the community of the school attendance area in providing appropriate options for early childhood education and related services. Its members could prepare and maintain a current census of children age 0-8 years. They could assist with early childhood screening processes to determine needs and could maintain the records of information collected. They could monitor the files to identify children needing either preschool or in-school services. They could assist in maintaining a listing of the school personnel needing them. They could assist in developing and implementing a referral system.

They could assist in developing and disseminating public information. It would be extremely important to establish the responsibility and work of the local council on a sound legal policy base with clearcut guidelines because of the sensitive nature of the information each would deal with and because of the right of children and families to privacy and confidentiality.

Question 2.) The important aspect of any child development program is to strengthen the family structure in our country and to that extent the bill provides for direct parent involvement in child care programs. To what extent do you think parents should be involved in the policy making and day to day operations of child development programs, and how is the best way to gain parent participation and involvement in your programs?

Response - It is very important that parents participate in the election of school board members, and become candidates themselves for membership on school boards, and other policy making groups.

Parents should be involved in activities of the goal-setting process for their public schools. Vermont's optional school approval process outlines procedures for such participation from early childhood through secondary education.

All agencies should join forces to strengthen the American family. The need for parenting skills is a need which links and loops in and out of many social service agencies. Because every community has an elementary school and a mechanism for administering programs, education is in a prime position to be the lead agency in fostering activities to strengthen and enhance family life.

Quotes from the Report on Early Childhood Education in Vermont (December 12, 1974) are given below:

> High School Courses on Parenting
>
> It is clear that our high schools have an unequaled opportunity to provide programs to prepare young people of both sexes for parenthood. Students of junior and senior high school age often work well with young children and have an interest in learning about them. As they do so, they gain insights into their own lives. At no time after the high school years will educators be able to reach such a large proportion of those who will be the parents of tomorrow. Every encouragement should be given to the high schools to develop and maintain imaginative, effective and appealing programs on this topic.
>
> Post-School Parent Education
>
> Since the first months and years of a child's life are the most crucial of all, needs include parent education as well as health, educational, and social programs and services with fully qualified professional and para-professional personnel to provide them. In a state, the needs of its children can best be met through coordinated, collaborative effort on the part of local communities and institutions as they are served and assisted by state agencies, institutions including educational television, all working in coordination. The assessment and identification of need must be sufficiently refined to permit the design of programs and services which are individualized rather than general for all children. The resources must be allocated on the basis of needs identified and the priorities agreed upon by the decisionmakers. All of this calls for a comprehensive plan with a built-in elective in parent education for all and with a viable schedule for its implementation.

If the principle of equal educational opportunity is to prevail and if the early years are indeed of crucial importance to children's later achievement in youth and adulthood, then our state and our nation must give greater attention to children in their earliest years. With cooperation and collaboration among families, agencies, and services and with a range of acceptable options and approaches available to communities and families, the goal can be realized. If we value our children, we can muster the will to accomplish the task.

It is heartening indeed that our CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS are concerned with this vital issue which is central to human betterment.

Sincerely,

Karlene

KARLENE V. RUSSELL
Director of Elementary and Secondary Education
Vermont State Department of Education

KVR/cv

cc: Senator Mondale

November 12, 1975

Mr. Rolland C. Gerhart, Jr.
Director
Office of Child Development
Heritage House, Inc.
81 River Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Dear Mr. Gerhart:

Thank you very much for your letter of November seventh with your responses to the questions I asked regarding the Child and Family Services Act.

The information which you provided will be most helpful and I appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert T. Stafford
United States Senator

RTS/ghp

office of
child development

HERITAGE HOUSE INC
81 RIVER STREET
MONTPELIER, VERMONT 05602

STATE OF VERMONT
agency of
HUMAN SERVICES

November 7, 1975

Senator Robert T. Stafford
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

Thank you for your continued interest in the Child & Family Services Act. My answers to your questions are listed below:

1. Local school boards and authorities are constituted to deal with the disbursement of local taxes toward the public education program of the State. Early Child Development is not like public education neither in its intent nor scope. Local school boards have no tradition or any other particular attribute which would establish their appropriateness toward administering child development and family service programs.

   Family service organizations, State Offices of Child Development and other organs of the State and community dealing with the broad context of families and children should receive prime sponsorship rather than departments of education and school boards.

2. Day care facilities which produce the desired quality of child care required under the Act should be paid for their services with no discrimination as to whether they are private-for-profit or non-profit organizations. The service rendered, not the auspices, is the question.

3. Administrative opportunity and facility providing parental involvement in all aspects of the daily program and general administration of day care is desirable. Policy decisions within the competency of parents should be entertained by parents.

   Planned participation of parents in the day care center as assistants is desirable. The art of using parents needs further development.

The Child and Family Services Act should not include reference to Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements as presently written. States should have the opportunity to develop and manage their own day care programs. The fault of the present F.I.D.C.R. regulations is that they reach all the way to the individual day care facility which has established a confusing and upsetting regulatory dilemma between State licensing and money management texts. The Federal regulations should be addressed to the State administration of day care programs, not directly to the providers of day care.

Sincerely,

Rolland C. Gerhart, Jr.
Director

RG/dla

State of Vermont

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

AGENCY OF HUMAN SERVICES

Main Office
81 River Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Commissioner's Office

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division
Division of Services for the Blind
and Visually Handicapped
Social Services Division
Vocational Rehabilitation Division
Disability Determination Unit

Walter F. Mondale, Chairman
Subcommittee on Children and Youth
and
Robert T. Stafford, Ranking Republican
Subcommittee on Children and Youth
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senators Mondale and Stafford:

Thank you for forwarding a copy of the testimony which I delivered at the hearing on the Child and Family Services Act held in Montpelier, Vermont in April of 1975. These remarks were delivered on behalf of Commissioner Handy of the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services and he has also asked me to respond to the follow-up questions which you posed.

Question: Should local school agencies be prime sponsors for any child and family services program?

Answer: This Department does not support the contention that local school districts should be prime sponsors for a child and family services program for the following reasons:

1. Prime sponsorship should not be broken down to the local level. Efficiency, management and cost factors would seem to argue strongly in favor of a statewide or at least regional approach to program administration.

2. The educational system is not prepared to administer a broad based child and family services program. Although school systems are beginning to give attention to social aspects of the educational experience as reflected in the growing number of high school programs where a course or two in money management, marriage or parenting skills are offered, by and large the educational system still deals with the child in a socio-cultural vacuum. This is not to argue that such a focus and the skills necessary to translate it into an effective, well managed program could never be

developed or acquired by a school system, but rather to suggest that there would seem to be other administrative vehicles, such as State Child Welfare programs, that are already identified with the goals and purposes of the proposed act, have administrative structure in place covering all areas of every state, and would be in a far better position than local school systems to efficiently and effectively utilize the resources offered by this act to meet the needs of families and children.

Question: To what extent should parents be involved in the policy-making day to day operations of child development programs, and how is parent participation and involvement gained?

Answer: Parent involvement is essential to a sound child development program. The model developed by Head Start or similar parent advisory groups would be one way of proceeding, however, the level and frequency of contact between program staff and parent needs to be higher in order to assure program success. This would require a system of regular "parent-teacher" contact, hopefully on at least a weekly basis.

I hope these responses are helpful to your consideration of S-626. Thank you again for offering this Department an opportunity to comment and for soliciting our opinion on the above questions.

Sincerely,

Allen R. Ploof

Allen R. Ploof
Director of Social Services

ARP/pr

Vermont Child Care '76 Campaign, Inc.

19 Kingsland Terrace • Burlington, Vermont 05401

TEL: (802) 862-0405

RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

1. SCHOOLS. We believe that it is essential for child development programs to cooperate and interact with local schools in order to provide continuity of service to children and to facilitate a cross-fertilization of values, ideas and program components that have been found to be valid and effective, but we do not believe that schools should be given priority in assuming prime sponsorship or adminiutration and contrl of child development programs.

   As we understand their position, teachers' organizations (primarily the American Federation of Teachers) believe that "surplus" elementary and secondary teachers can be retrained to assume child development responsibilities, that unused space in schools due to declining birth rates and enrollment can be used well by child development programs and that child development philosophy can be a catalyst to improve public education. Would that it were so and so easy, but we are skeptical and aprehensive.

   Certainly teachers can (and should!) be retrained, but this involves not only the acquisition of new skills but a fundamental change in values and philosophy of education. Early childhood education is much more than mere cognitive development.

   Utilization of excess space in public schools is also to be desired, but care must be taken that preschool children are not simply dumped into an environment designed (well or no) for older children. A firm commitment must be made to renovating such space so that it is appropriate for younger children.

   Most importantly, since teachers lack almost as much power within schools as do students, we believe it is wholly unrealistic to suppose that even effectively retrained teachers who are committed to the concepts of early childhood education and child development can really turn around the public school system. It seems far more realistic to work for such change from the outside by example than to be coopted on the inside.

2. FOR-PROFIT CENTERS. We are aprehensive of the quality of services in general that may be available through for-profit centers and find it difficult to believe, based on our experience and

observations, that they can indeed be profitable without tending to engage in such abuses as have recently been cited in the nursing home industry. However, provided that rates of reimbursement for services and, particlarly, the level of quality can be assured, parents should be allowed the option of choosing such a service for their children. Not to allow for-profit centers to receive federal funds would be an unwise and unwarrented constraint on families' free choice.

3. PARENT INVOLVEMENT. Indeed, parent involvement is essential to the provision of services that are responsive to family needs and values. Parents should have a controlling interest in a program's governing board and therefor control over policy decisions. They should also be invited and encouraged to spend time in the program observing and even assisting in program activities. Participation must not be required, however; the intent of these programs is to benefit, not coerce, families.

Responses of Ann D'Olier, Teacher/Director, The Tots School, Montpelier, Vt.

1. The administration of a child development family services program is best governed by a group of responsible community representatives as well as parents and staff interested in the services. Each program would most likely look for community members interested in supporting such a program. A local school board member may wish to serve on the committee. I don't feel all the representatives of the local school board should be delegates on this committee but that a even distribution of talents and people should be represented.

2. I don't want private for profit day care centers to receive federal funding under this program. The idea of big business is to invest and take a risk on eventually making a profit. It is extremely difficult to find any funds for starting up day care centers or nursery schools;non profit organizations rarely have funds necessary in the beginning.

3. I'm not a parent so it is difficult for me to answer the last question. I've directed a parent co-operative so I will speak from this prospective. Policy decisions were made at parent meetings or by the board of parents. For the most part day by day decisions were the responsibility of the head teacher and parents working as teacher aides. I don't feel parents should be required to spend time in a day care center to assist the staff during the open hours but rather be involved according to their talents and schedules.

Ann d'Olier

ANN D' OLIER
TEACHER/DIRECTOR
The Tots School
Montpelier, Vt.

July 29, 1975

Senator Robert T. Stafford
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford,

Responses to your questions reguarding the Child and Family Services Act:

1. School Run Day Care? I don't believe that any specific group should be given priority status as the exclusive (or even majority) prime sponsoring organization. I believe that in assigning such a role to any group (especially school boards with their oft-times rigid and uncreative memberships) would doom the "effect" of the Act to a pretty bureaucratic, regimented style of operations which would negate the exciting possiblilities of a truly comprehensive, decently supported child care system. My position is that we ought to allow community resources and needs dictate a multi-layered array of alternatives for the families in our communities. A regional advisory group would consider applications from potential providers and match services to consumers (e.g. in Burlington, I would hope that this free enterprise "marketing" would invite applications from elementary schools in center city, community agencies in suburbia, small scattered individual units in Milton/Huntington/Starksboro type of areas, churches, parent's groups, etc.).

2. Profit Day Care Centers? I'm not unilaterally opposed to proprietary day care. I believe that sometimes volume and a little entrepreneurial "hustling" can produce some good results for kids, modern facilities and be depended upon for a kind of continuity that's hard to find in the day care sector. Yet I do have some hesitations about profit centered day care and feel it should only accept federal/state/local funds under the strictest

guidelines and monitoring. I believe that whenever the profit motive is introduced into any enterprise, one needs to expect to watch out for a small (but predictable) number of abusive "fast buck" artists. I would assume that the dilemma facing you policymakers on this question is simply this: do we want to finance the screening machinery as part of the legislation in order to sort the honest business persons from the crooks?.

3. Parent Involvement; Parent involvement is both an idyllic principle to espouse and an impossible demand to impose "across the board". I do not believe that parent involvement can be legislated or even should be. Although it is my feeling that solid day care systems once placed intact in our cities and towns will generate parent support, I believe this is a natural evolutionary process which takes time, energy and patience. Denial of day care to the children of a family because their parents will not "involve" themselves does great harm to the actualization of Vermont families.

Sincerely,

R. James LeFevre

R. James LeFevre
Ex-Chairman of
Child Advocates,
Inc.

Responses of Daniel Albert, Director, Ethan Allen Child Care (Formerly UVM Day Care)

1.) Since the hearing that was held in Vermont, the AFL-CIO and the American Federation of Teachers have taken a firm stand that local school agencies should be prime sponsors for any child and family services program. As an individual who is involved in the operation of such a program, we should very much appreciate your views on this matter.

2.) The important aspect of any child development program is to strengthen the family structure in our county and to that extent the bill provides for direct parent involvement in child care programs. To what extent do you think parents should be involved in the policy making and day to day operations of child development programs, and how is the best way to gain parent participation and involvement in your programs?

1) As mentioned in my testimony, I strongly oppose any pre-determined or preferential system of determining prime sponsorship, including but not limited to local school agencies. To give preference or exclusive privilege to school agencies 1) cuts off those who have been providing these services over the years and who are in many ways best equipped to provide them 2) subjects them to the problems of the education system (size, funding, over-bureaucratization, etc). 3) concedes to the pressures of a powerful lobby force that has clear self-interest (rather than child and family interest) at stake.

2) Parents should be involved in the policy making of every program involving their children. This should be a real rabber than a lip-service power. The idea of mandated parent policy making bodies for every program is certainly an acceptable means of achieving this objective. On the other hand, based on experience, I think it is unrealistic and in some ways self-defeating to expect day to day involvement of parents in child development programs. Especially since many parents are working full schedules such involvement is too much to expect in many cases. Such expectations often lead to the dominance of middle and upper income parents when one of the goals of our programs should be to encourage income-mixing in the classroom as well as in the leadership positions among the parents.

Daniel Albert, director
Ethan Allen Child Care
(Formerly UVM Day Care)

SUGAR MAPLE CHILDREN'S CENTER, INC.

37 NORTH MAIN STREET · RUTLAND, VERMONT 05701 · (802) 775-0698

August 20, 1975

Honorable Robert T. Stafford
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

Thank you for taking an interest in our children and for striving for better children's legislation. I am happy to respond to your questionnaire received in July, 1975.

1. In the past school boards and school authorities have not shown a real interest in early childhood programs and/or day care centers. They have always looked upon them in a critical "black sheep" manner. Schools are political and get locked into a rigid set of rules and regulations not allowing them the flexibility to consider individual families' or individual children's needs. Now that money is again in question many people without qualifications in the area of early childhood are jumping on the band - wagon. A good preschool program depends upon flexibility and dedication. I have yet to see a school anywhere that has set up a system which allows this kind of mobility and the freedom to continue with positive growth to meet the needs of our changing American family. Local school boards and local authorities should definitely *NOT* be allowed to be prime sponsors or administrators of any early childhood programs. They are already encumbered with the public school problems. My true feelings are; that this new interest is present in early childhood programs only because dollars are there. Again let us take a look to see where the true interest all ready lies in this field. Can you imagine an unemployed chemistry teacher in a preschool class? Preposterous to even contemplate.

2. Profit making should be allowed on a limited selective basis only. Profits take money that could better be utilized in programming.

3. Parents should be involved in over-all policy decisions

> to create an agency that meets group and individual needs. On day to day operation, decision making should fall only to a qualified person hired to carry out the policies and regulations which insure the program stability and consistency. Parents are working and cannot spend time during operation hours of a Center. However they should show interest and cooperation for other kinds of necessities of daily operation.

I hope I have been of some assistance to you in your effort. I am available for further information at any time.

Sincerely,

Charlotte A. Much

Charlotte A. Much
Director

THE
DAY
CARE
CENTER
INC.
P.O. Box 69
649-1403
Norwich, Vt. 05055

July 30, 1975

The Honorable Robert T. Stafford
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

The attached transcript is correct.

In response to your questions:

1. Should local school boards and authorities have priority as prime sponsors?

No, I do not think it should be national policy. I feel Education, because of its historical development, is in some regions locked into a structure incapable of adapting to child and family needs.

I would recommend priority for prime sponsorship be given to existing structures administering child and family services because they have the expertise and commitment to strengthening families. Where Education is administering day care services in a particular locality, they would then be considered for such priority in sponsorship.

I feel very strongly that this legislation, to be successful, must dovetail existing child and family services through those channels presently functioning.

2. Should Federal support be available to profit motived day care centers?

No, I do not believe the motivation for profit can be relegated by owners to the primary concern for quality services. While profit oriented centers are supported in Vermont at present, I feel the additional funds available from being tax exempt and the philosophical purpose for nonprofit agencies contributes to higher quality services.

3. What should be the level of parent involvement in day care centers?

As an Administrator, I support a simple majority of parents on boards and would urge such a policy. I do not think it is necessary to require parents to spend time in a day care center. For working parents, this would be impossible.

Thank you for your continued interest in our services. I would be available for any further assistance in my role here or as a member of the Vermont Day Care Advisory Committee.

I feel this legislation could be very beneficial and should not get bogged down in territorial disputes.

Sincerely,

John Fransway
Administrator

Peg Martin
33 Seminary St.
Middlebury, Vt. 05753
Nov. 4th 1975

Response to questions re. operation of Child and Family Services Act:

1) I do not believe local school boards and authorities should be given automatic priority as prime sponsors or administraters for the proposed child development plan. There are several reasons for my opinion:

-The educational institution has become generally (or at least too frequently) quite set in its outlook and mode of operation; a problem that most institutions must deal with sooner or later. The development and expansion of pre-school programs has, in many instances, come about in reaction to school systems and the educational institution. Children entering kindergarten (if it exists) and first grade are expected to "fit" the system and little attempt is made to find out what size the system should be to fit the child. Pre-school and child development programs have been a healthy pressure for change. It is unlikely that this situation would continue if local school boards and authorities were also responsible for child development programs.

This is not to imply that the school system and child development programs should go their own separate ways. The most successful child dev. programs have stimulated a healthy, though not always comfortable dialogue. Both the school system and child dev. programs have had to examine their rationale and approach and adjust as necessary. I believe this "bumping of noses" will be extremely beneficial in the long run. The participation of school boards and/or administraters should be built into child dev. programs and vice versa, but each should maintain its integrity.

-The need for teachers is diminishing as the school population drops nationally. I am evil enough to believe the unions and teachers' organizations who are suddenly advocates of child development programs and of institutional control of these programs, see such programs as another source of job opportunities. The training being given teachers does not necessarily qualify them as staff in a child development pre-school program. The requirements of the educational institution does not, unfortunately, automatically produce a quality pre-school teacher.

2) The dilemma is the monitoring of quality programs, evaluation and accountability, not necessarily profit vs. non-profit child development programs. Given a large population center and an income which does not fluctuate wildly; it is probably possible to run a good, profit-making center. In Vermont this is not likely, and frequently profit-making centers must cut corners which is good for neither children or program.

Generally speaking, I would greatly prefer to use Federal funding for only non-profit centers. At the very least a profit-making center that purchases equipment, busses, etc. with Federal funds should be prohibited from selling same.

Inasmuch as becoming a non-profit organization is not a great legal obstacle, non-profit status is not a panacea. The real crux lies in a good system of evaluation and the establishment of a comprehensive set of standards for child development programs.

3) Parental involvement in a center is invaluable and essential. It is, unfortunately, also achieved (or not achieved) in as many ways as there are programs. Mandating a percentage of parents on boards may or may not result in active participation. It can't hurt.

Parents will, of necessity, even if it is only locating a lost sneaker or complaining about the paint stains that won't come out, be involved to some degree in the day to day operation of a center. However most of the routine operation must be left to staff because they provide a continuity and overall perspective [illegible] one parent can have.

I personally feel that parents must be involved in policy and decision-making. This might be as a board member or as a member of a sub-committee appointed to consider a special problem. It is often difficult to coax parents away from the kinds of jobs and projects with which they are comfortable - ie. the ubiquitous pot-luck supper fund-raiser. Parents frequently have to be convinced 1) that they have something valid to say 2) that there is a process by which they can express themselves, and 3) that they will be heard.

Requiring parents to invest time in the program their child is enrolled in is a valid request. However it must be a flexible requirement as many working parents are unable to spend time during actual program hours. (Current eligibility requirements in Vermont would prohibit participation by subsidized parents during program hours as authorization is given only for working hours.) I believe it is entirely reasonable to request that parents assume some responsibility for a service which benefits them and their child. Participation in policy-making and responsibility for some aspects of physical maintenance usually increases a parent's understanding of just what is happening and why, and results in infinitely better communication between staff and families. Most of us are "hooked" on the puritan ethic to some degree - we value that which we work for. (What happens to those who don't is another issue.)

Responses of:
John Black, Director
Orleans County Council of Social Agencies, Inc
Worcester, Vermont

The Committee has received much testimony from across the country and in Vermont concerning three important matters which deal with the general operation of the Child and Family Services Act. We would appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1.) What role should local school boards and authorities play in the administration of a child development family services program? Should they be given a priority for being prime sponsors or administrators of a child development plan as is supported by the unions and teachers organizations?

2.) Much testimony has been given concerning the role of private for profit day care centers being allowed to receive federal funding under this program. What do you feel the federal attitude should be toward profit making in day care centers as compared to private, non-profits, which now operate and do receive federal support?

3.) The principal component in the operation of a child and family related day care center is the involvement of the parents. To what extent should you be involved in the policy making decisions of a day care center and the day to day operational decisions of a day care center? Should you be required to spend time in a day care center to assist the staff of the centers?

1: Local School boards Should not be directly involved in Adm. of Child & Family Services program. Nor Should they be considered as prime sponsors. To date they have demonstrated singular inability to administer or respond to Community Education Needs. Early Child devl. is not a man or woman power program.

2: The army is public, much urban Transit is public, the major sector of University are public, one function of Gov. is to provide for public needs in Ed. Welfare, Health – NO profit should be derived from Human needs – therefore no private profit Corp. should be allowed.

3. Much of a childs needs should and can be met by parents

OVER →

3. con't

One of the major faults with public Education at All levels. Therefore all policy Councils should have 51% parent membership. Furthermore if an effective management system setting forth clearly policy vs. operation decisions and who shall make which, then little Confusion should result. I feel that policy Councils should make policy and hold staff responsible for operation decisions which should flow from policy.

Responses of:

DR FREDERICK C HOLMES, M.D.
AMERICAN ACADEMY of PEDIATRICS
St Albans, Vt.

The Committee has received much testimony from across the country and in Vermont concerning three important matters which deal with the general operation of the Child and Family Services Act. We would appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1.) What role should local school boards and authorities play in the administration of a child development family services program? Should they be given a priority for being prime sponsors or administrators of a child development plan as is supported by the unions and teachers organizations? No Policy team

2.) Much testimony has been given concerning the role of private for profit day care centers being allowed to receive federal funding under this program. What do you feel the federal attitude should be toward profit making in day care centers as compared to private, non-profits, which now operate and do receive federal support? Yes

3.) The principal component in the operation of a child and family related day care center is the involvement of the parents. To what extent should you be involved in the policy making decisions of a day care center and the day to day operational decisions of a day care center? Should you be required to spend time in a day care center to assist the staff of the centers? Yes No

① Education is a critical component for child + family guidance, and should continue to serve as a ~~[illegible]~~ leading source of information. But, the overall program should be administered by a group with no particular "axe to grind", composed of medical care, social service, education and consumer.

② Yes federal funding should be provided, why should children be discriminated against if their children can afford to go to a private center

③ Parents should be involved in all components of control.

FCHolmes, M.D.

CHILD AND FAMILY
SERVICES ACT
Answers to Questions

1.It is recommended that the administration of a child development family services program should be the responsibility of child development agencies and personnel. The school system is already overburdened with a proliferation of responsibilities beyond what is usually considered the core function of education. To add further duties would dilute the system to a greater degree.

Some states, Vermont included, still do not have mandatory public kindergarten and it seems that this should be a priority before local school boards are expected to embrace the concept of serving children below kindergarten age. Many children do not reach the school system until too late for early intervantion which might prevent some of the problems currently seen in school.

Ideally collaboration between child development agencies and schools could result in the latter enriching their parents education and family life courses in elemantary and junior high schools to supplement the child and family services of the former.

2. With the fading capability of federal funding to meet all the needs, it would seem inconsistent to direct funds to profit-making enterprises. Such day care operations would still attract those who are able to meet the expense.

Actually the existence of both types might be of mutual benefit.

3. Parents should participate in board activity and policy. The day to day operational decisions are customarily left to professional staff with the support of board committees if indicated.

It is recommended that parents should be expected to spend some time assisting staff. The time involved and the type of assistance will vary with the individual needs and requirements of the parents. Such contact facilitates the parent education process and implements the integration of the child's experience at the facility with that in his home.

July 29, 1975

Marrion E. Waite
Box 385
Montpelier, Vt. 05602
(for New England Children's
Mental Health Task Force)

SPONSORSHIP

1. To my knowledge I know of no group which consistently, throughout their history, have been more rife with internal struggles of a philosophical, economic or political nature than school boards and school administrations. In Vermont this is especially true as residents of towns, school boards, school administrations and State Administration are in a never ending war with each other. Schools have fallen into general disfavor and townspeople have begun seriously thinking of new priorities, including changing the tax base and dissolution of school unions. To make Education the prime sponsors of this human service program in Vermont would be disastrous. In this State the natural recipient of the proposal would be the Agency of Human Services.

PROFIT/NON-PROFIT

2. Quality should be the measure of funding and transcends questions of profit or non-profit organization. If quality is too hard to measure then profit making centers should not be discriminated against under this Bill. Make quality monitoring part of the bill; that is what is really important.

PARENTS AS VOLUNTEERS

3. No one should be forced to "do their duty." Many parents choose not to become active in their children's programs whether day care, school, etc. Forcing them to do so will increase attendance statistics and add only disgruntledness to the center. In monitoring it will be important to check whether parents are being warmly welcomed and intelligently invited to attend in operational decisions or day to day center programming. No one should make demands beyond this.

Roger Strauss

Roger Strauss, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Washington County Mental Health
Services, Inc.
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Questions From Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth Re: the Child and Family Services Act of 1975

1. I believe I have already addressed this in my testimony.

2. Although I did speak rather tangentially to this issue in my testimony, I would like to re-emphasize that programs should receive funds based upon the quality of service which they provide. If private-for-profit centers can provide high quality services and can meet all the required federal standards (staff/child ratios, provision of ancillary services, etc.) they should be allowed to receive funding. However, I also beleive that there must be adequate monitoring and controls to assure that everyone receiving funds is really meeting the standards, not the haphazard system which presently exists.

3. I addressed this issue in the testimoney which I gave before Joint Hearings in Washington, during August 1974. I believe parents should paly a strong role in all facets of Child Development programs in which their children are enrolled, including policy-making. However, there must be clear delineation between policy-making and day-to-day administration. And training must be provided for parents in how to fulfill these functions. No parent should be required to participate in center activities for his child to be enrolled because it is often the children who need the program the most whose parents have the least motivation to participate. It is often a slow process to "woo" them into center activities, but well worth the effort.

Patricia A Jewett
Swampscott, MA.

New Hampshire Children '76

64 North Main Street
Concord, N.H. 03301
(603) 224-5655

48 Tremont Square
Claremont, N.H. 03743
(603) 542-2233

November 14, 1975

Senator Robert T. Stafford
Ranking Republican
Subcommittee on Children and Youth
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and edit my testimony. I have made one minor adjustment, but it otherwise looks fine.

In response to your questions:

1) I feel very strongly that prime sponsors should be chosen on the basis of ability to provide a quality service, rather than by making a single legislative designation. Some public schools would be eminently qualified to offer wonderful programs, others absolutely would not. As I stated in my testimony, I see diversity in a delivery system as a precious and necessary quality if a comprehensive pre-school program is to meet the diverse needs of American people and communities.

2) Parents should feel a great deal or ownership in child development programs, for those programs are the parent designated substitutes. All child development programs should be acutely accountable to the parents being served. An excellent model of parent involvement in both policy making and program has been developed in Head Start programs, and I would suggest that perhaps these models, materials and models be reviewed in terms of adaptability for the kinds of programs S.626 will provide.

Again, I hope, for our country and our children that this bill will succeed and appreciate your efforts on its' behalf.

Sincerely,

Nina Sazer

NINA SAZER, State Director

NS:dg
Enc.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO WITNESSES APPEARING ON APRIL 26, 1975 FOR WRITTEN ANSWERS

1.) Since the hearing that was held in Vermont, the AFL-CIO and the American Federation of Teachers have taken a firm stand that local school agencies should be prime sponsors for any child and family services program. As an individual who is involved in the operation of such a program, we should very much appreciate your views on this matter.

2.) The important aspect of any child development program is to strengthen the family structure in our county and to that extent the bill provides for direct parent involvement in child care programs. To what extent do you think parents should be involved in the policy making and day to day operations of child development programs, and how is the best way to gain parent participation and involvement in your programs?

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO WITNESSES APPEARING ON APRIL 26, 1975 IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE

Investment Property
New Homes

Joseph A. Giancola
Real Estate-Developer-Builder
Edgewood Drive
Rutland, Vermont 05701

Residential
Commercial
Industrial
—
Telephone
773-6881
Area Code 802

August 8, 1975

Robert T. Stafford
Vermont
5219 Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Stafford,

As per your request I am answering the three questions on the Child and Family Service Act.

1. The local School Boards and Authorities should not have a role to play in the child Development Program. They have their hands full with just running a school system and all of the many different programs that they now have to run and administer
2. Federal funds for this program should only be given to private non profit Day Care Centers. This way more dollars can go into the care of the children instead of a profit to some person or corporation.
3. Parents should play a role in the operation of the Day Care Center and help establish its policy but only on a voluntary basis.

Joseph A Giancola
Joseph A. Giancola
Board of Directors
Sugar Maple Children's Center
Rutland, Vt

JAG/js

22 Tanglewood Drive
So. Burlington, Vermont
05401

August 13, 1975

Senator Robert T. Stafford
Subcommittee of Children and Youth
Labor and Public Welfare Committee
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Stafford:

If response to your letter of July 8, 1975, enclosing a copy of my testimony on the Child and Family Services Act that the Subcommittee on Children and Youth held in Montpelier in April, the transcript of my testimony is accurate.

Regarding the two questions enclosed:

1. I am firmly opposed to pre-school programs being put in the hands of people who are trained to run programs for and to educate school age children. The needs and goals for these two groups are totally different; as are the methods used to reach these different groups of children.

2. Parents can and should be involved in everything that goes on at the child care center. Parents can serve on the Board and it's committees. Such committees might include: curriculum, personnel, finance, and resource. This is one of the ways parents are involved at Marni's school, the Ethan Allen Child Care Center.

   In addition, monthly meetings between parents and staff are a great help. Programs for these meetings (such as toilet training, speech problems, sexism, a one-parent home) help to promote involvement rather than turn this into a social exchange.

   Individual conferences between parents and teachers, when either feels the need, should always be available.

It should be noted that the goals of these two questions are in total opposition.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify on this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Kay Stambler

Mrs. Henry Stambler

Responses of:
MRS. ROBERT M. HATHAWAY
70 Phillips Street
Rutland, Vermont 05701

Keep them out

This was adequately explained in Montpelier!

1.) Since the hearing that was held in Vermont, the AFL-CIO and the American Federation of Teachers have taken a firm stand that local school agencies should be prime sponsors for any child and family services program. As an individual who is involved in the operation of such a program, we should very much appreciate your views on this matter.

2.) The important aspect of any child development program is to strengthen the family structure in our county and to that extent the bill provides for direct parent involvement in child care programs. To what extent do you think parents should be involved in the policy making and day to day operations of child development programs, and how is the best way to gain parent participation and involvement in your programs?

Parents should be on local boards to set policies. Ten parents per board should suffice.

#1) The local School Agency seems to always be concerned with internal matters more than child-related matters. Speaking for myself, I would rather see the child & family services program administered by folks who are trained specifically in this field. The school system is too large now to handle specific problems, especially with young children & most parents. No - not the school system.

I would like to see it run "somewhat" along the guidelines of the Mental Health Organization - locally.

Keep the Unions out. They see some possible money from this "Act" and want to get in. Run it individually with experienced, Child - caring personnel.

#2 As for working parents - they seem, for the most part, to be left without much ~~[illegible]~~ "children" time. The time can be found if they are interested enough. I for one (as per my transcript) do find time to help. As to how to get others to help - I don't know!! They seem to love their children, but don't want to do anything special with them. I can't understand this. Someone more trained to handle parents should work locally I guess. Parents should be involved to an extent. But too much involvement causes much friction - I have seen this. Something must be done to bring parent & children to one unit again. How???

Respectfully Submitted,
Suzanne D Hathaway

MRS. ROBERT M. HATHAWAY
70 Phillips Street
Rutland, Vermont 05701

Responses of Margaret Murray, Parent of a Day Care Child, Waterbury, Vt.

1.) Since the hearing that was held in Vermont, the AFL-CIO and the American Federation of Teachers have taken a firm stand that local school agencies should be prime sponsors for any child and family services program. As an individual who is involved in the operation of such a program, we should very much appreciate your views on this matter.

2.) The important aspect of any child development program is to strengthen the family structure in our county and to that extent the bill provides for direct parent involvement in child care programs. To what extent do you think parents should be involved in the policy making and day to day operations of child development programs, and how is the best way to gain parent participation and involvement in your programs?

1) No. Education is too large a system.

2) Change the basic HEW theory... just enough to survive.

M. Murray
Parent of a Day Care Child
Waterbury Vt

M. Seymour
Parent of a Child in Day Care
Burlington Vt

Replies to questions:

1) I believe that it is favorable in many ways thatlocal school boards and authorities seem to be taking a greater interest in the development of children before they reach school age, and yet, I find that same involvement alarming. Nowhere in this question do I find mention of the child and his/her family. Elementary schools are notorious for their lack of family involvement and I'd be really concerned that this would get lost in the administrative take-over. Parents should have a voice - a good loud one, in the making of policy for their children. I also believe that the integration of the family into the larger community is important for the helath of the family too - works both ways.

2) I believe that education, at all levels from"pre-school" through college and graduate school, should be freely available to everyone. It seems that such a program would only be possible through the funding and resources of the federal government, but it should be administered by the recipients - who know better than anyone else their own needs. Profits should not be made on learning. I would favor government supported, small scale and family administered - non-profit- day care.

3) This question is basically answered by the two above. The more parental involvement the better, but most nine-five jobs being what they are we will have to have some wide-spread reforms, I believe to make this possible. Parents could perhaps be given a certain number of hours free from their jobs to participate in day care during the day, when the children are there. This would obviously involve the co-operation ~~fm~~ of employers, to pay absent workers, and I'm pretty cynical about that, but it's what I'd like to see.

There are many other than obvious ways that parents can assist in real ways in the center operation - providing transportation, for example, or sharing interests and skills - woodworking, maybe or reading aloud to

Seymour

children.

I believe that it is unrealistic to expect to make it mandatory for parents to participate unless you can pay them, just as they would be paid for their time on the job, so perhaps the place to focus your concern might be in the area of making incentives to companies or other employers who make it possible, financially and transportationwise, for their employees to spend time in the centers.

Parents should be fully involved in all aspects of policy and day to day operations of the centers, though for each to be~~d~~ fully participatory and functional would take time and training, on the parts of both parents and staff. Much energy and talent is available, in parents, though, that is often overlooked. The key, as I said above, is through employers, though. People's lives - home, job, schools, are too fragmented - there has to be more caring, on the parts of bosses, administrators, school and family.

to the United States sub. Comitte on children and youth

II, 1 I don't believe that our teachers should take a firm stand that local agencies slould not be the prime sponsers for any Child and family service program because I like the thought of the school being a school and a day care centr be seen as is with pride and love.

II 2 I think that parent should be involved in the policy making and day to day opeation of child development program because parents realy want to know what is going on and want to help and the best way to gain it is with know-ledge the more the parent know the better parent

I think they would make. for our children are important to us. And parents want to know what they can do, and by letting the parents decide what they would like done in our Center and help follow it thru.

Sincerely
Jeanne Allain
Parent of a child in Day Care
Chester, Vt

Nov 5. 1975
Box 177
Barton Vt.
05822

Dear Senator Robert T. Stafford

Here is your answer to 1-3 that you asked me to make out.

1) The school should stay out of it because they have enough to take care of dealing with the older children. This is a feeling of another parent. I would like to see the school system more aware of whats we are doing in parent-child-center.

2) In my mine both are ~~enough~~ equally important. In my situation the private one suits me best. because I live in a small rural community

3.) In the PCC. center the parent are involved in Policy making decision. Most of our Com. are made up of more then 50% of parent.

3) We as parent of PCC. are involved with our children. Bes of Day-Care the parent are working so it is hard for them to spend time at the Day-Care-Center.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours.
Mrs Ethel Powell
Barton Parent-Child Center
Barton, Vt

Sub. Committee On Children + Youth

Estelle Harmon Answer Q. (1)

Grandmother of Headstart Child, Member SFC Board of Dirs

I do not feel that local school agencies should sponsor this service program. I cannot see any reason for this. As an individual, and I have been in this program, as you all know for ten years, what I see is that a child has all the advantages of learning, working with staff that understand children, that have a lot of patience in whatever needs to be accomplished through the child.

I believe that there will be more upsets, more distress, less attention given to children, some need more, others need less, but this would not occur outside of the program as it stands. The health and welfare of the child would soon be abolished, these children now have. What the World needs is plenty of it. One person cannot fill the place of the members we now have.

What we now have is the most valuable method for children, especially growing up in the world of today. Let's Keep it.

Sub-Committee on Children & Youth

Esther Herman
Vancouver 9 ('2)

A family has to be involved at a very early age in a child's life, as a child grows every day, and the family is interested, the child has a much better chance to see things that, otherwise he would never know.

Family involvement is the start of a child's learning years. This gives a child a large assurance that his parents are interested in what happens every day, and will help him to become closer to his family, will understand more clearly its ways of life. This gives a child a big boost in knowing there is someone that can help if needed.

In the program now, families are together with their children, doing things together, having their small failures to face together (if any). This also gives a child a much better out-look on life. Children are happier, more contented, more interested, care a lot more, everyone is working together, to make it a happy, and secure place for children.

I think parents should be leaders,

not followers. Parent involvement not only means your family, but you are interested in every child, whether it's your child or your neighbors.

This program as it stands now is togetherness. That's what it is really all about. Helping each other, and in this program has grown more, and more parents are becoming involved, each child has the share of a decent life, and looking forward to a greater goal, than if it were abolished.

This is a child's world, let's help them keep it this way. It's a much more different world to live in, together with this program as it is we can do just that. How we can through family, and staff keep up with the world, the standards of our child, which would not be possible otherwise.

The [illegible] bringing Parents together working together, sharing all the difficulties of our every-day life.

Aug. 5, 1975

John Abbott
Paramedic
Peoples Free Clinic Inc
Burlington Vt.

Senator Robert Stafford
/US Committee on Children and Youth / S. 626
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator:

Thank you again for the opportunity to present Testimony at your hearings in Montpelier. It was truly a valuable experience for me.

Enclosed is the edited copy of my Testimony.

I will address myself to the questions that you have offered.

1) Concerning the position taken by the AFL-CIO and the American Federation of Teachers: It is my opinion that the best interests of the Bill, that is to involve parents and children in a wide range of programs and activities, will be met by the involvement of local school agencies as prime sponsors. However, the projection of school agencies as the sole prime sponsors would be a mistake, in that it would discourage the kind of diversity and freedom of design that the bill now seems to advocate. It has been repeated and proven that it is best to expand programs by building upon existing facilities, and I think it is clear that in many areas programs that operate independently of

the school system deserve and will solicit prime sponsorship. (ie. day care centers, Visiting Nurse assoc.)

The present integration of school systems on a state-wide level might cause conflicts in the appropriation requests of the various local school agencies if they were to act as sole prime sponsors.

Such a rule placed in the bill might truly discourage the participation and enthusiasm of independent-thinking parents.

So, even though the projection of local school agencies acting as prime sponsors is a realistic one, I think that writing the law such that these agencies would be the sole prime sponsors would be limiting and not in the best interest of the goals of the bill.

2). Concerning Parent participation in policy making.

I agree strongly with the plan outlined in the bill establishing "Parent Policy Committees".

We at the Clinic are constantly beset with the problem that many low income parents do not always act in the interest of their children, and that often there must be "something in it" for the parent as well as the child. Making the parent realize that they are happy and rewarded by their childs happiness and wellbeing is an important part of the process of participation. I must anticipate the need for outreach volunteers or workers to help raise the general consciousness of the potential of the "Child and Family Services Act"

Thank You Again

John Abbott

5-C Inc.
Consumer Controlled Community Child Care, Inc.
15 PINE STREET
SPRINGFIELD, VERMONT 05156
802-885-2148

Hon. Robert T. Stafford
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 25010

Dear Bob,

Enclosed is the corrected transcript. There are duplications between this and my printed testimony. I do not know how you handle this but I do prefer the printed testimony if a choice must be made. I put darts at the beginning and ends of the parts substantially repeated in the printed version.

In response to the two questions attached, my positions have already been made clear but I shall restate them.

1.) The position of the AFT (American Federation of Teachers) is transparent and destructive. It is transparent because it is a cheap attempt to gather power and supply jobs to out-of-work teachers. Let me state that we do now employ teachers in our Head Start-Daycare Program if a) they are qualified and have the qualities to work with children and respect parents, poor or rich, and b) if they want to work badly enough to accept the miserably below-teacher-level salaries we are forced to pay due to inadequate funding levels. Not all teachers are automatically able to work developmentally attending to individual children's total needs, but I should think this goes without saying. The point is that some of our superior head staff who have been trained by professionals have no degrees and no teacher certification.

More dangerous is the concept of school boards and school administrations with little relation to parents gathering more power. They already have a huge task and powerful, monolithic control. Other agencies for the development of child advocacy have a role to fill, espcecially in pre-school programs.

Non-profit child development corporations are a healthy outgrowth of Early Childhood and Child Developmental specialties. The Head Start model insisting on each of the components - Education, Health (medical health, dental, mental) Social Services and Parent Involvement is not one followed by the schools. For all the problems Head Start is still the best model around, one for Public Schools to enulate.

"Children Learn What They Live"

A corporation to promote and operate Child Development programs in Windsor and Windham Counties.

In addition it would be inefficient to destroy effective child developmental programs to transfer sponsorship.

Finally environments suitable to children's development must be constructed and created by child development specialist not school architects. Old school buildings if available could be transformed, but pre-schoolers and daycare should not be combined concurrently with public school programs in public school buildings unless the social and emotional needs of children are a priority of concern in that building.

From my experience there are some schools into which I could move a pre-school all-day child care program because there is concern for the total child and old barriers have disappeared, but these are the rare elementary schools. At present it is said that many High Schools could incorporate child care into their Child Development programs. I see it that a separate child care program could incorporate interested students into a stable well-staffed child developmental program for children. I do not subscribe to children being "used" in a child development laboratory for high school students.

Question 2.) is related to Question 1.) in that parents will lose involvement and control if the schools have prime sponsorship under most circumstances. The different attitudes of Head Start and Public Schools toward parents can be documented by parents. We are enclosing our By-laws to show just how much control we believe consumers, ie., parents should have.

Sincerely yours,

Ann Raynolds

Madeleine Kunin (Vermont House of Representatives)
122 Dunder Rd.
Burlington, Vermont 05401

Responses to questions:

1. I am undecided about involving local school boards in the administration of a child development family services program.

2. It depends on how profit is defined. Many day care centers in Vermont seem to have a combination of state subsidized and private children. I think it is important to provide federal funding to the point that the day care center can afford to stay open. How wide that margin of profit should be is a more diffiuult decision.

3. I think parent involvement should not be a pre-requisite (certain number of days and hours) because not all parents have the time or energy to participate in this process. I think there should be some type of governing board which includes parents in the decision making process of the day care center. Also, it would be good to have parent skills taught at the day care center and make this kind of a focal point to assist parents in improving their ability to deal with family situations.

STATE OF VERMONT
SENATE CHAMBER
MONTPELIER
05602

December 10, 1975

TO: Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Children and Youth

FROM: Robert V. Daniels, Vermont Senate

RE: Child and Family Services Act

1. Role of local schools:

I favor the maximum practical role for the schools, because (1) child services should be considered an extension of the public education responsibility, and (2) the educational implications and potential in child care should be emphasized. School districts could well administer community plans, but, as I noted in my testimony, the prime sponsor for a state the size of Vermont should be the state as a whole.

2. Profit day care centers:

I tend to be skeptical about the efficacy of profit enterprises in any human service operations. I would suggest that as far as possible the Act should try to arrange to meet the need through public or non-profit centers. Perhaps very small (baby-sitting) profit operations could be supported if necessary to provide the service.

3. Parent involvement:

This is good in principle, particularly to work out general methods and curricula and educate the parents. However, it should not be allowed to compromise the professional quality or the day to day managerial responsibilities of the program. Parent participation cannot possibly be made compulsory.

RVD/cgp